

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.2238 of 2020

T.Raja @ Auto Raja

: Petitioner

Vs.

- 1 The District Collector &
District Magistrate
Cuddalore District
Cuddalore
- 2 State of Tamil Nadu
represented by its Secretary
Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St. George
Chennai 600 009
- 3 The Superintendent of Police
Cuddalore
Cuddalore District
- 4 The Superintendent
Central Prison
Cuddalore District
- 5 The Inspector of Police
Annamalai Nagar Police Station
Annamalai Nagar
Cuddalore District

Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS calling for the entire records in connection with the order of detention passed by the first respondent dated 19.06.2020 in C3/D.O./76/2020, T.Raja @ Auto Raja, aged 30 years, S/o. Thamodharan, who is now detained in Central Prison, Cuddalore and set aside the same and direct the respondent to produce him before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For petitioner
For respondents

Mr.A.K.Manoj Kumar
Mr.R.Prathap Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

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

The detenu himself is the petitioner herein. He has been detained by the 1st respondent by his order dated 19.06.2020 in C3/D.O./76/2020, 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.

5. The Detention Order in question was passed on 19.06.2020. The petitioner made a representation on 06.07.2020. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 09.07.2020. The remarks were duly received on 24.07.2020. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 07.08.2020.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 15 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 4 days were Government Holidays and hence, there was an inordinate delay of 11 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 24.07.2020 and there was a delay of 14

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 4 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was 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 11 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority 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 C3/D.O./76/2020, dated 19.06.2020, passed by the 1st respondent is set aside. The detenu viz., T.Raja @ Auto Raja, aged 30 years, S/o. Thamodharan, 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 District Collector &
District Magistrate
Cuddalore District
Cuddalore
- 2 The Secretary to Government
Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St. George
Chennai 600 009
- 3 The Joint Secretary to Government
Public, Law and Order Department
Secretariat, Chennai-9
- 4 The Superintendent of Police
Cuddalore
Cuddalore District
- 5 The Superintendent
Central Prison
Cuddalore District
- 6 The Inspector of Police
Annamalai Nagar Police Station
Annamalai Nagar
Cuddalore District
- 7 The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.

+1cc to Mr.A.K.Manoj Kumar, Advocate, S.R.No.25534.

NRJK(CO)
CSR 28.04.2021

सत्यमेव जयते H.C.P.No.2238 of 2020

WEB COPY