

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 05.02.2021

Coram

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice P.N.PRAKASH
and
The Hon'ble Mr. Justice V.SIVAGNANAM

H.C.P.No.1508 of 2020

M.Senthilvasan ... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.State represented by
The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai Police,
Chennai.
- 2.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Puzhal.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
CCB, Cyber Crime,
Chennai.
(Crime No.249 of 2020) ... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the in connection with the order of detention passed by the 1st respondent herein vide order dated 27.07.2020 in Memo No.254/BCDFGISSSV/2020 against detenu M.Senthilvasan, S/o.Muthusamy, aged about 49 years, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal and set aside the same and consequently, direct the respondents to produce the body of the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Prathiban
for Mr.A.S.Aswin Prasanna

For Respondents: Mr.R.Prathap Kumar,
Addl.Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by V.SIVAGNANAM, J.]

The petitioner is detenu, M.Senthilvasan, S/o.Muthusamy, aged about 49 years. The detenu has been detained by the first respondent by his order dated 27.07.2020 in Memo No.254/BCDFGISSSV/2020, holding him to be a "Cyber Law Offender", as contemplated under Section 2(bb) 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 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. He also filed his counter affidavit.

5. The Detention Order in question was passed on 27.07.2020. The petitioner made a representation on 12.09.2020. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 12.09.2020. The remarks were duly received on 18.09.2020. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 06.11.2020.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 6 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 1 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 5 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 18.09.2020 and there was a delay of 47

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 17 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was inordinate delay of 30 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 30 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.

11. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Memo No.254/BCDFGISSSV/2020, dated 27.07.2020, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., M.Senthilvasan, S/o.Muthusamy, aged about 49 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

WEB COPY

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS VII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar


nsd

To

- 1.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai Police,
Chennai.
- 2.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai.
- 3.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public(Law & Order),
Fort Saint George, Chennai - 9.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Puzhal.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
CCB, Cyber Crime,
Chennai.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P. No. 1508 of 2020

mgr[col]
srg 23/02/2021



WEB COPY