



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED :05.10.2021

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V. BHARATHIDASAN

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R. PONGIAPPAN

H.C.P. (MD) No.587 of 2021

Manjula

... Petitioner/wife of the detenu

-Vs-

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Pudukkottai District, Pudukkottai.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
Thirugokarnam Police Station,
Pudukkottai District.
- 4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Trichy 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 relating to the impugned detention order made in P.D.O.No.16/2021 dated 29.03.2021 passed by the second respondent herein and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to set the detenu namely Devadiran, aged about 33 years at liberty who is confined at Central prison, Tiruchirapalli.

For Petitioner :Mr.T.Antony Arulraj

For Respondents :Mr.S.Ravi


Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

(Order of the Court was made by R.PONGIAPPAN, J.)

This habeas corpus petition has been filed by the wife of the detenu, namely, Devadiran, S/o.Rethinam, aged about 22 years, challenging the detention order in P.D.O.No.16/2021 dated 29.03.2021 passed by the second respondent, branding him as "Drug Offender" as contemplated under Section 2(e) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982.

2. Mr.T.Antony Arulraj, 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.

WEB COPY


3. Mr.Ravi, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, while reiterating the counter affidavit filed by the second respondent, 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 proforma has been furnished by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor. The proforma would indicate that as against the impugned detention order, the petitioner has made a representation to the 1st respondent on 01.04.2021 which was received on 05.04.2021. Remarks on the said representation were called for on 05.04.2021 and it was received on 30.04.2021. The Deputy Secretary concerned has dealt with the representation on 05.05.2021 and the Hon'ble Minister concerned has dealt with the representation on 12.05.2021 and finally, the representation came to be rejected on 07.06.2021. It is seen that in between 05.04.2021 and 30.04.2021, there was a delay of 24 days. After excluding the government holidays of 9 days, there was a delay of 15 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 15 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.



8. In fine, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detention order in P.D.O.No.16/2021 dated 29.03.2021 passed by the second respondent, is set aside. Consequently, the detenu, Devadiran, S/o. Rethinam, aged about 33 years, who is now detained at Central Prison, Thiruchirapalli, is directed to be released forthwith unless his presence or custody or detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (Records)

// True Copy //

/ /2021

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

pm/jbr

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,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Pudukkottai District, Pudukkottai.
3. The Inspector of Police,
Thirugokarnam Police Station,
Pudukkottai District.
4. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Trichy District.
5. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and Order),
Fort. St. George, Chennai-9
6. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

ORDER MADE IN

H.C.P.(MD) No.587 of 2021

DATED : 05.10.2021

GC(18.10.2021) 3P 7C

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