

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 26.04.2021

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.PONGIAPPAN

H.C.P.No.1899 of 2020

Rajeshwari,
W/o.Murugesan

Petitioner /
Mother of the detenu

versus

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Office of the Commissioner of Police
(Goondas Section),
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison-II, Puzhal,
Chennai - 600 066.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
V-5, Thirumangalam Police Station,
Chennai.

Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records connected with the detention order of the second respondent in No.344/BCDFGISSSV/2020 dated 03.09.2020 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body and person of petitioner's son namely Manikandan, son of Murugesan, aged 26, detained in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.M.Santharam

For Respondents : Mr.R.Prathap Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

[Order of the Court was made by R.PONGIAPPAN, J.]

Since date has already been fixed in this case for disposal in Crl.M.P.No.7422 of 2020, this matter has been taken up today.

2. The petitioner is the mother of the detenu, Manikandan, son of Murugesan, aged about 26 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by its order dated 03.09.2020 in No.344/BCDFGISSSV/2020, holding him to be a "Drug Offender", as contemplated under Section 2(e) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.

3. 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.

4. Though several grounds have been raised in this Petition, 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.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed this 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. सत्यमेव जयते

6. The Detention Order in question was passed on 03.09.2020. The petitioner made a representation on 05.10.2020. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 13.10.2020. The remarks were duly received on 17.10.2020. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 06.11.2020.

7. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was an inordinate delay of 4 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 17.10.2020 and

there was a delay of 18 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 6 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was inordinate delay of 12 days in considering the representation.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. 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.

11. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 4 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 12 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.

12. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in No.344/BCDFGISSSV/2020 dated 03.09.2020, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz. Manikandan, son of Murugesan, aged about 26 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS-VII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

sri

To

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Office of the Commissioner of Police
(Goondas Section),
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison-II, Puzhal,
Chennai - 600 066.


4.The Inspector of Police,
V-5, Thirumangalam Police Station,
Chennai.

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

6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.1899 of 2020

LN(CO)
CB(28/04/2021)



WEB COPY