



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.884 of 2021

Kaleeswari ... Petitioner/mother of the detenu
-Vs-

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Ramanathapuram District,
Ramanathapuram.
3. The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Madurai.

...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 impugned detention order passed by the second respondent and made in his proceedings in TN.P.D.A.B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V.NO.2/Goonda/2021 dated 20.01.2021 in detaining the detenu under the Tamilnadu Act 14 of 1982 under Section 2(f) as a GOONDA and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu namely Mantha @ mahendran, S/o.Malaikannan, aged about 29 years, who is detained in Central Prison, Madurai before this court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner :Mr.B.Santhanam Rajesh Kumar

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 mother of the detenu, namely, Mantha @ mahendran, S/o. Malaikannan, aged about 29 years, challenging the detention order in TN.P.D.A.B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V.NO.2/Goonda/2021 dated 20.01.2021



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

2. Mr.B.Santhanam Rajesh Kumar, 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.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 12.06.2021 which was received on 18.06.2021. Remarks on the said representation were called for on 18.06.2021 and it was received on 29.06.2021. The Deputy Secretary concerned has dealt with the representation on 30.06.2021 and the Hon'ble Minister concerned has dealt with the representation on 02.07.2021 and finally, the representation came to be rejected on 09.08.2021. It is seen that in between 18.06.2021 and 29.06.2021, there is a delay of 10 days. After excluding the government holidays of 4 days, there was a delay of 6 days in the I part and in between 02.07.2021 and 09.08.2021, there was a delay of 37 days, after excluding the Government Holidays of 13 days, there was a delay of 24 days in the II Part and totally there was a delay of 30 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 30 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 TN.P.D.A.B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V.NO.2/Goonda/2021 dated 20.01.2021 passed by the second respondent, is set aside. Consequently, the detenu, Mantha @ mahendran, S/o. Malaikannan, aged about 29 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 (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,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Ramanathapuram District,
Ramanathapuram.
3. The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Madurai



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

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

H.C.P. (MD) No.884 of 2021
DATED : 05.10.2021

MGJ(22.10.2021) 4P 6C