



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 16.08.2021

Coram

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH
and
THE HONOURABLE MS. JUSTICE R.N.MANJULA

H.C.P.No.493 of 2021

P.Pramila
W/o.Perumal

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police/Detaining Authority,
Greater Chennai,
Vepery, Chennai.

3.The Additional Superintendent,
Central Prison-II,
Puzhal, Chennai.

4.The Inspector of Police cum
Sponsoring Authority,
H3, Tondiarpet Police Station,
Chennai - 600 081.

.. Respondents

Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus to produce the body of the petitioner's son, viz., Mohan @ Aru @ Arumugam S/o.Perumal, aged about 23 years, who is detained under orders of second respondent, now confined at Central Prison II, Puzhal, Chennai and set him at liberty forthwith by calling for the records pursuant to the detention order dated 22.02.2021 made in Memo No.53/BCDFGISSSV/2021 on the file of second respondent herein and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Gopalakrishnan
For Respondents: Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Government Advocate [crl.side]



ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by P.N.PRAKASH, J]

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu viz., Mohan @ Aru @ Arumugam, aged 23 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Memo No.53/BCDFGISSSV/2021 dated 22.02.2021, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.

2. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate [Crl.side] appearing for the respondents. We have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.

3. Though several grounds have been raised in the Habeas Corpus Petition, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would mainly focus his argument on the ground that there is gross violation of procedural safeguards, which would vitiate the detention. The learned counsel, by placing authorities, submitted that the representation made by the petitioner was not considered on time and there was an inordinate and unexplained delay.

4. The learned Government Advocate [Crl.side] strongly opposed the Habeas Corpus Petition by filing his counter. He would submit that though there was delay in considering the representation, on that score alone, the impugned detention order cannot be quashed. According to the learned Government Advocate [Crl.side], no prejudice has been caused to the detenu and thus, there is no violation of the fundamental rights guaranteed under Articles 21 and 22 of the Constitution of India.

5. The Detention Order in question was passed on 22.02.2021. The petitioner made a representation on 20.03.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 23.03.2021. The remarks were duly received on 29.03.2021. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 15.04.2021.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 5 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 30.03.2021 and there was a delay of 12 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Electricity, Prohibition and Excise Department after the Deputy Secretary dealt with it, of which 5 days were



Government Holidays. Hence, there was inordinate delay of 12 days in considering the representation.

7. In *Rekha vs. State of Tamil Nadu* (2011 (5) SCC 244), the Honourable Supreme Court has held that the procedural safeguards are required to be zealously watched and enforced by the Courts of law and their rigour cannot be allowed to be diluted on the basis of the nature of the alleged activities undertaken by the detenu.

8. In *Sumaiya vs. The Secretary to Government* (2007 (2) MWN (Cr.) 145), a Division Bench of this Court has held that the unexplained delay of three days in disposal of the representation made on behalf of the detenu would be sufficient to set aside the order of detention.

9. In *Tara Chand vs. State of Rajasthan and others*, reported in 1980 (2) SCC 321, the Honourable Supreme Court has held that any inordinate and unexplained delay on the part of the Government in considering the representation renders the very detention illegal.

10. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 5 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 7 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Electricity, Prohibition and Excise Department. The impugned detention order is, therefore, liable to be quashed.

In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Memo No.53/BCDFGISSSV/2021 dated 22.02.2021 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Mohan @ Aru @ Arumugam, aged 23 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS IX)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

gm

To

1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police/Detaining Authority,



Greater Chennai,
Vepery, Chennai.

3.The Additional Superintendent,
Central Prison-II,
Puzhal, Chennai.

4.The Inspector of Police cum
Sponsoring Authority,
H3, Tondiarpet Police Station,
Chennai - 600 081.

5.The Joint Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Public, Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.

6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

+1CC to Mr.B.GopalaKrishnan, Advocate SR No. 40609

H.C.P.No.493 of 2021

SSI (CO)
B.VC (17/08/2021)