

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 27.04.2021

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH
AND
THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE R.PONGIAPPAN

H.C.P.No.1958 of 2020

Valarmathi :Petitioner/Mother of Detenu

Vs.

- 1 State of Tamil Nadu
represented by the Secretary
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St. George
Chennai 600 009
- 2 The Commissioner of Police
The Greater Chennai City
Vepery
Chennai 600 007
- 3 The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal
Chennai 600 066
- 4 The Inspector of Police
K-9, Thiru.Vi. Ka. Nagar 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 records relating to the detention order in Memo No.375/BCDFGISSSV/2020 dated 17.09.2020 passed by the second respondent under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondent to produce the petitioner's son Velu @ Velayudham, aged 26 years, S/o Murugesan, the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set the petitioner's son Velu @ Velayudham S/o Murugesan, aged 26 years, the detenu herein at liberty.

For petitioner : Mr.D.Gopi Krishnan
For respondents : Mr.R.Prathap Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

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

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu viz., Velu @ Velayudham, aged 26 years, S/o Murugesan. The detenu has been detained by the 2nd respondent by his order dated 17.09.2020 in Memo No.375/BCDFGISSSV/2020, 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 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. सत्यमेव जयते

5. The Detention Order in question was passed on 17.09.2020. The petitioner made a representation on 12.10.2020. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 15.10.2020. 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.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 17.10.2020 and there was a delay of 16 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 an inordinate delay of 10 days in considering the representation.

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 10 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.

In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Memo No.375/BCDFGISSSV/2020, dated 17.09.2020, passed by the 2nd respondent is set aside. The detenu viz., Velu @ Velayudham, aged 26 years, S/o Murugesan, is directed to be released forthwith, unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS III)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar


gya

To

- 1 The Secretary
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Government of Tamil Nadu
Fort St. George
Chennai 600 009
- 2 The Joint Secretary to Government
Public, Law and Order Department
Secretariat, Chennai-9
- 3 The Commissioner of Police
The Greater Chennai City
Vepery
Chennai 600 007
- 4 The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal
Chennai 600 066
- 5 The Inspector of Police
K-9, Thiru.Vi.Ka. Nagar Police Station
Chennai
6. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.1958 of 2020

AD(CO)
CSR 28.04.2021



WEB COPY