

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.2508 of 2020

B.Priya

... Petitioner

-vs-

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu
rep. by the Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate
Erode District, Erode.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Coimbatore.
- 4.The Superintendent of Police,
Erode District, Erode.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Modakkurichi Police Station,
Erode District.

... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the entire records from the 2nd respondent in connection with order in Cr.M.P.No.30/Goonda/2020/C1 dated 19.11.2020 and quash the same and produce the petitioner's husband namely Prabhakaran @ Boopathy, S/o.(Late) Manickam, aged 29 years, now confined in Central Prison, Coimbatore under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Pugalenth

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

O R D E R

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

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu - Prabhakaran @ Boopathy, S/o.(Late) Manickam, aged 29 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Cr.M.P.No.30/Goonda/2020/C1 dated 19.11.2020, 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 19.11.2020. The petitioner made a representation on 10.12.2020. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 15.12.2020. The remarks were duly received on 31.12.2020. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 11.01.2021.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 16 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 5 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 31.12.2020 and there was delay of 9 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 3 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was inordinate delay of 6 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 11 days in submitting the remarks and 6 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 Cr.M.P.No.30/Goonda/2020/C1 dated 19.11.2020, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Prabhakaran @ Boopathy, S/o. (Late) Manickam, aged 29 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-IV)

//True copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

mmi/rna

To

1. The Secretary to Government
The State of Tamil Nadu
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
2. The Joint Secretary to Government
Public (Law and order)
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
3. The District Collector and District Magistrate
Erode District, Erode.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Coimbatore.
5. The Superintendent of Police,
Erode District, Erode.
6. The Inspector of Police,
Modakkurichi Police Station, Erode District.
7. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.2508 of 2020

AJS (CO)
GMY (29/06/2021)



WEB COPY