

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 03.06.2021

Coram

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

H.C.P. No.2367 of 2020

S.Pathmavathi

.. Petitioner

Vs

1.The Additional Chief Secretary,
Home Prohibition and Excise Dept.,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Chennai City Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai - 7.

3.The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Central Prison, Salem - 636 007.

4.The Inspector of Police,
M6 Manali Police Station,
Manali, Chennai.

..Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records relating to the detention order vide memo No.420/BCDFGISSSV/2020 dated 20.10.2020 passed by the second respondent and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the body of the detenu Gunganraj, S/o.Selvaraj, aged 24 years, now confined in Central Prison, Salem, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Rajkumar Pandian
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 mother of the detenu - Gunganraj, S/o.Selvaraj, aged 24 years. The detenu has been detained by the

second respondent by his order in memo No.420/BCDFGIISSSV/2020 dated 20.10.2020, 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 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 20.10.2020. The petitioner made a representation on 24.11.2020. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 27.11.2020. The remarks were duly received on 02.12.2020. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 09.01.2021.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 5 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 2 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 3 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 02.12.2020 and there was delay of 37 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 12 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was inordinate delay of 25 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 3 days in submitting the remarks and 25 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.420/BCDFGISSSV/2020 dated 20.10.2020, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Gunganraj, S/o.Selvaraj, aged 24 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

s/d-
Assistant Registrar

True Copy

Sub-Assistant Registrar

mmi/ssm

To

1.The Additional Chief Secretary,
Home Prohibition and Excise Dept.,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.

2.The Joint Secretary to Government
Public (law and order)
Fort. St. George
Chennai 9.

3.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Chennai City Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai - 7.


4.The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Central Prison, Salem - 636 007.

5.The Inspector of Police,
M6 Manali Police Station,
Manali, Chennai.

6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P. No.2367 of 2020

JPL(CO)
SP(14/06/2021)



WEB COPY