



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 24.09.2021

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH
AND
THE HONOURABLE Ms.JUSTICE R.N.MANJULA

H.C.P.No.790 of 2021

Nithya Ruby

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by its Secretary
Prohibition & Excise Department
Fort St. George, Chennai-9

2.The District Magistrate and District Collector
Namakkal
Namakkal District

3.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison
Salem, Salem District

4.The Inspector of Police
Rasipuram Police Station
Rasipuram Taluk
Namakkal District

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS to call for the records of the detention order dated 06.03.2021 in CMP.No.3/GOONDA/2021(M1) on the file of the 2nd respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the body of the detenu Sathish @ Stephen, aged about 38 years, S/o.Anthonydoss @ Joseph, who is now confined in the Central Prison, Salem before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Thamaraiselvan

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor



WEB COPY

O R D E R

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

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu, Sathish @ Stephen, aged about 38 years, S/o.Anthonydoss @ Joseph. The detenu has been detained by the 2nd respondent by his order dated 06.03.2021 in CMP.No.3/GOONDA/2021(M1), 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 Additional Public Prosecutor 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 Additional Public Prosecutor filed his counter affidavit and strongly 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 Additional Public Prosecutor, 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 06.03.2021. The petitioner made a representation on 09.05.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 25.08.2021. The remarks were duly received on 13.09.2021. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 17.09.2021.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 19 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 8 days were Government Holidays and hence,



there was an inordinate delay of 11 days in submitting the remarks.

7. In *Rekha Vs. State of Tamil Nadu* [2011 (5) SCC 244], the Hon'ble 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 Hon'ble 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 11 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 CMP.No.3/GOONDA/2021(M1) dated 06.03.2021, passed by the 2nd respondent is set aside. The detenu viz., Sathish @ Stephen, aged about 38 years, S/o.Anthonydoss @ Joseph, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

gya

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS IX)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar



To

WEB COPY

- 1.The Secretary
Prohibition & Excise Department
Fort St. George, Chennai-9
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector
Namakkal
Namakkal District
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison
Salem, Salem District
- 4.The Inspector of Police
Rasipuram Police Station
Rasipuram Taluk
Namakkal District
- 5.The Joint Secretary to Government
Public, Law and Order Department
Secretariat, Chennai-9
- 6.The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras

H.C.P.No.790 of 2021

CNR(CO)
EU 27.09.2021