



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 18.08.2021

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V.BHARATHIDASAN
and
THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE J.NISHA BANU
H.C.P.(MD) No.1222 of 2020**

Subramanian ...Petitioner/ Father of the Detenu
vs.

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
 - 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Tiruchirappalli City,
Tiruchirappalli.
 - 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.
 4. The Inspector of Police,
Cantonment Police Station,
Tiruchirappalli.
- ...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 in C.No.29/Detention/C.P.O/T.C/ 2020 dated 23.11.2020 on the file of the Respondent No.2 and quash the same as illegal and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the Petitioner's son namely Kishorekumar, S/o. Subramanian aged about 23 years now confined at Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.M.A.Jinnah

For Respondents : Mr.S.Ravi
Standing counsel for Government



O R D E R

(Order of the Court was made by J.NISHA BANU, J.)


This habeas corpus petition has been filed by the Father of the detenu, namely, Kishorekumar, S/o.Subramanian, aged about 23 years, against the detention order passed by the second respondent, in C.No.29/Detention/C.P.O/T.C/2020 dated 23.11.2020, branding him as 'Goonda' as contemplated under Section 2(f) of the Tamil Nadu Act, 14 of 1982.

2. Mr.S.M.A.Jinnah, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, would submit that the detenu was remanded in two adverse cases and one ground case. Against which, the detenu has filed bail applications and the same were dismissed and the third bail application for the ground case alone is pending. However, the Detaining Authority, to arrive at the subjective satisfaction, has stated that there is a real possibility of the detenu being released on bail by filing bail application. It is the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the Detaining Authority failed to place the bail application in Cr.M.P.No.3825 of 2020, filed before the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge, Tiruchirapalli, in the booklet. Further, he would submit that the detenu was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 02.11.2020 and within 20 days, the detention order has been passed against him in a hurried manner. 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.

3. Mr.S.Ravi, learned Standing counsel appearing for the respondents, 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. In the instant case, the proforma furnished by the learned Standing counsel would indicate that as against the impugned detention order, the petitioner made a representation to the first respondent on 17.12.2020 and it was received on 22.12.2020. Remarks were called for on 23.12.2020 and it was received on 26.12.2020.



The Deputy Secretary dealt with the matter on 28.12.2020. The concerned Minister dealt with the matter on 09.01.2021 and the representation came to be rejected on 11.01.2021. It is seen that in between 28.12.2020 and 09.01.2021, there was a delay of 9 days, after excluding the Government Holidays of 2 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 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.

8. In fine, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detention order made in Detention Order in C.No.29/Detention/C.P.O/T.C/2020 dated 23.11.2020, passed by the second respondent, is set aside. Consequently, the detenu, namely, Kishorekumar, S/o.Subramanian, aged about 23 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 (AS)

// 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.

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



To

1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Tiruchirappalli City,
Tiruchirappalli.

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

4.The Inspector of Police,
Cantonment Police Station,
Tiruchirappalli.

5.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public(Law & order),
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 9.

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

H.C.P. (MD) No.1222 of 2020

18.08.2021

MGJ(03.09.2021) 4P 7C