



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 01.07.2022

Coram:

The Honourable Mr. Justice S.VAIDYANATHAN
and
The Honourable Mr. Justice A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

H.C.P.No.161 of 2022

Rani

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Government of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Vellore District.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Vellore District.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Vellore.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Ponnai Police Station,
Vellore District.
(Crime No.249/2021)

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the entire records, in C3/D.O.NO.96/2021 dated 21.11.2021, on the file of the second respondent and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioners son Mr.Parthiban, aged 29 years, S/o. Kamalanathan who is now confined in Central Prison, Vellore before this Court and set him at liberty.



WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr. S.Silambuselvan
For Respondents : Mr. M.Babu Muthumeeran
Additional
Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Hearing was made through Hybrid mode)

S.VAIDYANATHAN, J.,

and

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.,

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu Parthiban, aged 29, S/o.Kamalanathan. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C3/D.O.No.96/2021 dated 21.11.2021, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.

2. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents. We have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.

3. Though several grounds have been raised in the Habeas Corpus Petition, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would mainly focus his argument on the ground that there is gross violation of procedural safeguards, which would vitiate the detention. The learned counsel, by placing authorities, submitted that the representation made by the petitioner was not considered on time and there was an inordinate and unexplained delay.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor vehemently opposed the Habeas Corpus Petition by filing a counter affidavit. He would submit that though there was delay in considering the representation, on that score alone, the impugned detention order cannot be quashed. According to the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, no prejudice has been caused to the detenu and thus, there is no violation of the fundamental rights guaranteed under Articles 21 and 22 of the Constitution of India.

5. The Detention Order in question was passed on 21.11.2021. The petitioner made a representation on 08.12.2021. Thereafter,



remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 09.12.2021. The remarks were duly received on 23.12.2021. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 03.01.2022.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 16 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 4 days were Government Holiday and hence there was a delay of 12 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 23.12.2021 and there was an inordinate delay of 12 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Home, Prohibition and Excise (IX) Department after the Deputy Secretary dealt with it, of which 5 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was inordinate delay of 7 days in considering the representation.

7. In *Rekha vs. State of Tamil Nadu* (2011 (5) SCC 244), the Honourable Supreme Court has held that the procedural safeguards are required to be zealously watched and enforced by the Courts of law and their rigour cannot be allowed to be diluted on the basis of the nature of the alleged activities undertaken by the detenu.

8. In *Sumaiya vs. The Secretary to Government* (2007 (2) MWN (Cr.) 145), a Division Bench of this Court has held that the unexplained delay of three days in disposal of the representation made on behalf of the detenu would be sufficient to set aside the order of detention.

9. In *Tara Chand vs. State of Rajasthan and others*, reported in 1980 (2) SCC 321, the Honourable Supreme Court has held that any inordinate and unexplained delay on the part of the Government in considering the representation renders the very detention illegal.

10. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 12 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 7 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Home, Prohibition and Excise (IX) Department. The impugned detention order is, therefore, liable to be quashed.



In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in C3/D.O.No.96/2021 dated 21.11.2021, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Parthiban, aged 29, S/o.Kamalanathan, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CO)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar

bkn

To

1. The Secretary,
Government of Tamilnadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (L & O) Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-9.
3. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Vellore District.
4. The Superintendent of Police,
Vellore District.
5. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Vellore.
6. The Inspector of Police,
Ponnai Police Station,
Vellore District.
- 7.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.161 of 2022

GPL(CO)
CB(08/07/2022)