

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 02.06.2021

CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice M.M.SUNDRESH
and
The Hon'ble Ms. Justice R.N.MANJULA

H.C.P.No.2056 of 2020

P.Prasanya

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Secretariat, Chennai - 9.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Vellore , Vellore District.

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

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Vellore, Vellore District.

5.The Inspector of Police,
Pernampet Police Station,
Vellore District.

... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the second respondent dated 22.10.2020 in his office Ref.C3.D.O.No.92/2020 against the petitioner's husband by name Thiru.Prabakaran, S/o.Moorthi, aged about 30 years, now under the custody of the 4th respondent namely Central Prison, Vellore, Vellore District and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the above said detenu before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.E.Kannadasan

For Respondents: Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Government Advocate
(Criminal Side)

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by M.M.SUNDRESH, J.)

The petitioner is the wife of Prabakaran, S/o.Moorthi, aged about 30 years, who is the detenu. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C3.D.O.No.92/2020 dated 22.10.2020, holding him to be a "Bootlegger", as contemplated under Section 2(b) 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 Government Advocate (Criminal Side) 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 Government Advocate (Criminal Side) 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 Government Advocate (Criminal Side), 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 22.10.2020. The petitioner made a representation on 07.11.2020. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 11.11.2020. The remarks were duly received on 29.11.2020. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 04.12.2020.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 18 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 6 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 12 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 29.11.2020 and there was delay of 5 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister

for Electricity, Prohibition and Excise Department after the Deputy Secretary dealt with it, hence, there was inordinate delay of 5 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 12 days in submitting the remarks and 5 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 C3.D.O.No.92/2020 dated 22.10.2020 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Prabakaran, S/o.Moorthi, aged about 30 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-
सत्यमेव जयते

Assistant Registrar(CS V)

//True Copy//

WEB COPY

Sub Assistant Registrar

mmi/ssm
To

1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Secretariat, Chennai - 9.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Vellore , Vellore District.

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


4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Vellore, Vellore District.

5.The Inspector of Police,
Pernampet Police Station,
Vellore District.

6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P. No.2056 of 2020

smi[col]
srg 10/06/2021



WEB COPY