



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 06.10.2021

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V. BHARATHIDASAN

and

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE J.NISHA BANU

H.C.P. (MD) No.255 of 2021

Jayasurya@Sundarapandi

... Petitioner/Detenu

-vs-

1. The Principal Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commission of Police,
Madurai City,
Madurai.

3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Madurai Central Prison,
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 entire records, connected with the detention order of the respondent No.2 in Detention Order No.13/BCDFGISSSV/2021, dated 30.01.2021 and quash the same and to direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Jayasurya @ Sundarapandi, S/o. Tamilselvan, aged about 21 years, now confining as "Goonda" at Madurai Central Prison before this court and set him at liberty.


For Petitioner : Mr.R.Prakash

For Respondents : Mr.S.Ravi
Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

(Order of the Court was made by V. BHARATHIDASAN, J.)

This habeas corpus petition has been filed by the detenu, namely, Jayasurya @ Sundarapandi, S/o. Tamilselvan, aged about 21 years, praying the detention order in No.13/BCDFGISSSV/2021,



dated 30.01.2021, passed by the second respondent, branding him as "Goonda" as contemplated under Section 2(f) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982.

2. Mr.R.Prakash, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, would argue that the detenu filed a bail application in the ground case and the same was dismissed and thereafter, he filed second bail application and the same is pending. However, the Detaining Authority, to arrive at the subjective satisfaction, has stated that the detenu likely to be released on bail in the ground case. He would further submit that the subjective satisfaction reached by the Detaining Authority is without any basis and there is no imminent possibility of the detenu coming out on bail by filing bail petition before the appropriate Court. Further, there is no cogent materials available before the Detaining Authority relating to the possibility of the detenu for coming out on bail. That apart, the detenu was arrested on 14.12.2020, but the Detaining Authority has passed the detention order against the detenu after 47 days ie., on 30.01.2021 and the delay for passing the detention order was not properly explained by the Detaining Authority.

3. Mr.S.Ravi, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing 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 the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials available on record.

5. Even though the learned counsel for 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.

6. In the instant case, the proforma furnished by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor would indicate that as against the impugned detention order, the petitioner made a representation to the first respondent on 06.02.2021 and it was received on 11.02.2021. Remarks were called for on ie., on 12.02.2021 and it was received on 18.02.2021. The Deputy Secretary dealt with the



matter on 18.02.2021. The concerned Minister dealt with the matter on 27.02.2021 and the representation came to be rejected on 27.02.2021. It is seen that in between 12.02.2021 and 18.02.2021, 18.02.2021 and 27.02.2021, there was a delay of 13 days, after excluding the Government Holidays of 4 days, there was a delay of 9 days in considering the petitioner's representation.

7. 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.

8. In the case on hand, as stated supra, the delay of 9 days in considering the representation of the petitioner has not been properly explained 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.

9. In fine, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detention order in No.13/BCDFGISSSV/2021, dated 30.01.2021, passed by the second respondent, is set aside. Consequently, the detenu, Jayasurya @ Sundarapandi, S/o. Tamilselvan, aged about 21 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 (CS-III)

// True Copy //

/ /2021

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

akv

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 Principal Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commission of Police,
Madurai City,
Madurai.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Madurai Central Prison,
Madurai District.
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.
5. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public(Law&Order),
Fort St. George,
Chennai 600 009.

H.C.P. (MD) No.255 of 2021

DATED : 06.10.2021

RK/PM(09/11/2021) 4P 6C