



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 15.11.2021

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE R.HEMALATHA

H.C.P.No.967 of 2021

R.Kasthuri
W/o.Ramesh

..Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Secretary to Government,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise IX,
Secretariat, St.George Fort,
Chennai - 600 009.

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector
and District Magistrate,
Cuddalore.

3. The Superintendent of Police,
Cuddalore District,Cuddalore.

4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Cuddalore.

5. The Inspector of Police,
Annamalai Nagar Police Station,
Cuddalore District.

..Respondents

Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records of the second respondent in reference to detention order No.C3/D.O/11/2021 dated 10.04.2021, setting aside the order of detention passed therein and directing the respondent to produce the detenu, namely, Ramesh s/o.Balakrishnan, aged about 37 years, before this Court, who is now detained at Central Prison, Cuddalore and setting him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.J.Pradeep

For Respondents: Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor



O R D E R
[Order of the Court was made by R.HEMALATHA, J]

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Ramesh s/o.Balakrishnan, aged about 37 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C3/D.O/11/2021 dated 10.04.2021, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) of the 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 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 10.04.2021. The petitioner made a representation dated 13.05.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 26.05.2021. The remarks were duly received on 25.06.2021. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 09.08.2021.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 29 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 8 days were Government Holidays and hence, there was an inordinate delay of 21 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 25.06.2021. Hence, there was inordinate delay of 21 days in considering the representation.

7. In *Rekha vs. State of Tamil Nadu* (2011 (5) SCC 244), the



WEB COPY

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 21 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 C3/D.O/11/2021 dated 10.04.2021 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Ramesh s/o.Balakrishnan, aged about 37 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CO)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

gm

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise IX,
Secretariat, St.George Fort,
Chennai - 600 009.



2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Cuddalore.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Cuddalore District,
Cuddalore.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Cuddalore.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Annamalai Nagar Police Station,
Cuddalore District.
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.967 of 2021

KSM(CO)
RGA(18/11/2021)