



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 20.07.2021

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.KALYANASUNDARAM
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE B.PUGALENDHI**

H.C.P. (MD) No.9 of 2021

Albonse Mery ... Petitioner/Mother of the detenu

-vs-

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009.

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

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Madurai,
Madurai District. ... Respondents

PRAYER : Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issue of a Writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records pertaining to the Detention Order No.81/Goonda/2020, dated 28.11.2020 passed by the second respondent and set aside the same by setting the detenu namely, Stalin @ Stalin Joseph, son of Antony Samy, aged about 35 years at liberty, now detained at Central Prison, Madurai.


For Petitioner : Mr.J.William Christopher

For Respondents : Mr.S.Ravi,
Standing Counsel for the State

O R D E R

(Order of the Court was made by K.KALYANASUNDARAM, J.)

This habeas corpus petition has been filed by the Mother of the detenu, namely, Stalin @ Stalin Joseph, son of Antony Samy, aged about 35 years, challenging the detention order No.81/Goonda/2020,



dated 28.11.2020, passed by the second respondent, branding him as "Goonda" as contemplated under Section 2(f) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982.

2. Mr.J.William Christopher, learned counsel for the petitioner, would argue that even though the petitioner has raised several grounds, he has confined his arguments only to the delay in disposal of the petitioner's representation. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the procedural safeguards guaranteed under Articles 21 and 22 of the Constitution of India have not been followed in this case and there is unexplained and inordinate delay in disposal of the petitioner's representation, which would vitiate the impugned order of detention.

3. Mr.S.Ravi, learned Standing Counsel for the State, on instructions, submitted that after satisfying with the materials placed by the Sponsoring Authority, the Detaining Authority has passed the detention order and there is no illegality or infirmity in the detention order. It is also stated that even if there is any delay in disposal of the representation, it has not caused any prejudice to the rights of the detenu and hence, prayed for dismissal of the habeas corpus petition.

4. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

5. In the instant case, the pro-forma furnished by the learned Standing Counsel for the State would indicate that as against the impugned detention order, the petitioner made a representation to the first respondent on 4.12.2020 and it was received on 12.01.2021. Remarks were called for on the same day i.e. 12.01.2021 and it was received on 21.01.2021. The Deputy Secretary dealt with the matter on 22.01.2021. The concerned Minister dealt with the matter on 4.2.2021 and the representation came to be rejected on 4.2.2021. It is seen that in between 12.01.2021 and 21.1.2021, there was a delay of 8 days, after excluding the Government Holidays of 5 days, there was a delay of 3 days in the first part and in between 22.01.2021 and 4.2.2021, there was a delay of 11 days, after excluding the Government Holidays of 6 days, there was a delay of 5 days in the second part, in considering the petitioner's representation.

6. At this juncture, it is useful to refer the decision of the Honourable Apex Court in the case of ***Rajammal vs. State of Tamil Nadu and another***, reported in **1999 (1) SCC 417**, wherein, the Apex Court has observed and held that it is for the Authority concerned to explain the delay, if any, in disposal of the representation and if any delay was caused on account of nay indifference or lapse in considering the representation, such delay will adversely affect further detention of the prisoner.



7. In the case on hand, as stated supra, the delay of 8 days in considering the representation of the petitioner remains unexplained by the respondents. Hence, in our considered view, the detention order is liable to be set aside solely on the ground of delay by following the decision of the Honourable Apex Court referred supra.

8. In fine, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detention order in Detention Order No.81/Goonda/2020, dated 28.11.2020, passed by the second respondent, is set aside. Consequently, the detenu, namely, Stalin @ Stalin Joseph, son of Antony Samy, aged about 35 years, who is now detained at Central Prison, Madurai is directed to be released forthwith unless his presence or custody or detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CO)

// True Copy //

/ /2021

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

vsn

Note :

In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the advocate / litigant concerned.

To:

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Dindigul,
Dindigul District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Madurai,
Madurai District.



4.The Joint Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,Public(Law&order) ,
Secretariat,
Chennai-9.

5.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

ORDER MADE IN

H.C.P. (MD) No.9 of 2021
20.07.2021

RKN (29.07.2021) 4P 6C