



WEB COPY

H.C.P.(MD) No.406 of 2021

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED :14.07.2021

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.KALYANASUNDARAM

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE B.PUGALENDHI

H.C.P. (MD) No.406 of 2021

A.Seetha

... Petitioner/wife of the
detenu

-vs-

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

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

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.

5.The Inspector of Police,
Musiri Police Station,
Trichy.

... 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 order of detention dated 22.2.2021 passed by the second respondent in C.M.P.No.09/2021 and to quash the same and to produce the detenu Aravindan, aged about 32 years, son of Muthaiah, now detained at the Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Narayanan

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 wife of the detenu, namely, Aravindan, son of Muthaiah, aged about 32 years, challenging the detention order in C.M.P.No.09/2021, dated 22.2.2021, 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.Narayanan, 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 26.02.2021 and it was received on 02.03.2021. Remarks were called for on the same day i.e. 2.3.2021 and it was received on 22.3.2021. The Deputy Secretary dealt with the matter on 22.3.2021. The concerned Minister dealt with the matter on 12.4.2021 and the representation came to be rejected on 15.4.2021. It is seen that in between 22.3.2021 and 12.4.2021, there was a delay of 20 days, after excluding the Government Holidays of 8 days, there was a delay of 12 days 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 12 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 Cr.M.P.No.09/2021, dated 22.02.2021 passed by the second respondent, is set aside. Consequently, the detenu, namely, Aravindan, son of Muthaiah, aged about 32 years, who is now detained at Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli 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-I)

// 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 Secretary to Government,
Home Department,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tiruchirappalli District,
Tiruchirappalli.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Tiruchirappalli.

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>



4.The Superintendent of Prison,Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.

5.The Inspector of Police,
Musiri Police Station,
Trichy.

6.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law & Order)
Fort St. George,
Chennai 600 009

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

+1 CC to M/s.R.NARAYANAN, Advocate (SR-22776[F] dated 15/07/2021)

H.C.P. (MD) No.406 of 2021
14.07.2021

RK (03.08.2021) 4P 9C