



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 14.09.2021

Coram

The Honourable Mr. Justice P.N.PRAKASH
and
The Honourable Ms. Justice R.N.MANJULA

H.C.P.No.646 of 2021

Deepa Sri Siva .. Petitioner/Wife of Detenu

Vs.

1. State of Tamil Nadu represented by
The Principal Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat Complex,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and
District Magistrate,
Erode District,
Erode - 638 011.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prisons,
Coimbatore Central Prison,
Coimbatore - 641 018.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
Perundurai Police Station,
Perundurai - 638 052.
- 5.The Superintendent of Police,
Erode District,
Erode.

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to calling for the records relating to the detention order in Cr.M.P.No.08/Goonda/2021 C1 dated 04.03.2021 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu Jayachandiran, aged about 31 years, who is presently confined in the Central Prison, Coimbatore, before this Court and set him at liberty.



WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.Balaji Thirumoorthy
For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj,
Govt.Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu Jayachandiran, aged about 31 years, son of Jayaraj. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Cr.M.P.No.08/Goonda/2021 C1 dated 04.03.2021, 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) opposed the Habeas Corpus Petition. 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 04.03.2021. The petitioner made a representation on 23.03.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 25.03.2021. The remarks were duly received on 16.04.2021. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 19.04.2021.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a



delay of 22 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which, 9 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 13 days in submitting the remarks.

WEB COPY

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 13 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority. 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 Cr.M.P.No.08/Goonda/2021 C1 dated 04.03.2021, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Jayachandiran, aged about 31 years, son of Jayaraj, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-II)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

nsd
To

1. The Principal Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat Complex,
Chennai-600 009.



2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Erode District,
Erode - 638 011.

3.The Superintendent of Prisons,
Coimbatore Central Prison,
Coimbatore - 641 018.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Perundurai Police Station,
Perundurai - 638 052.

5.The Superintendent of Police,
Erode District, Erode.

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

7.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.646 of 2021

SV I(CO)
GN(20/09/2021)