



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.63 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11.07.2022

Coram

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

H.C.P.No.63 of 2022

Matharasi.K

.. Petitioner

Vs

- 1.State represented by
The Secretary to Government, (Home),
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector-cum-District Magistrate,
O/o.District Collector-cum-District Magistrate,
Thiruvallur – 602 001.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
O/o.Superintendent of Police,
Thiruvallur – 602 001.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
(Law and Order),
Taluk Police Station,
Thiruvalur – 602 001.

.. Respondents



H.C.P.No.63 of 2022

WEB COPY

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records relating to the detention order against Durai Murugan @ Sattai Durai, S/o.Arunachalam, aged about 35 years, residing at No.746, 7th cross Street, Shanmugha Nagar, Uyyakondam Thirumalai Village, Trichirappalli (West) Taluk, Trichirappalli District, detained Central Prison, Puzhal-II, as Goonda B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V.No.01/2022 dated 02.01.2022 passed by 2nd respondent under Section 3(1) r/w section 3(2) of Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers , Cyber law offenders, Drug offenders, Forest offenders, Goondas, Immoral traffic offenders, Sand offenders, Sexual Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video pirates Act (Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982) and set the same and direct the respondents to produce the body of the detenu before this Court, now confined at the Central Prison, Puzhal-II and set the detenu at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Xavier Felix

For Respondents : Mr.M.Babu Muthumeeran
Addl. Public Prosecutor



H.C.P.No.63 of 2022

ORDER

S.VAIDYANATHAN, J.

and

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu Durai Murugan @ Sattai Durai, S/o.Arunachalam, aged about 35 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V.No.01/2022 dated 02.01.2022, 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 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 on behalf



H.C.P.No.63 of 2022

of the detenu was not considered in time and there was an inordinate and unexplained delay.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor strongly opposed the Habeas Corpus Petition by filing his counter. 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 02.01.2022. A representation was made on behalf of the detenu on 06.01.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 10.01.2022. The remarks were duly received on 21.02.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the representation on 18.04.2022.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 42 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of



H.C.P.No.63 of 2022

which, 15 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 27 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 21.02.2022 and there was a delay of 56 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Home, Prohibition and Excise Department after the Deputy Secretary dealt with it, of which, 18 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was an inordinate delay of 38 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.



H.C.P.No.63 of 2022

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 27 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 38 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Home, Prohibition and Excise 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 B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V.No.01/2022 dated 02.01.2022, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Durai Murugan @ Sattai Durai, S/o.Arunachalam, aged about 35 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

(S.V.N., J.) (A.D.J.C., J.)
11.07.2022

nsd



H.C.P.No.63 of 2022

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government, (Home),
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector-cum-District Magistrate,
O/o.District Collector-cum-District Magistrate,
Thiruvallur – 602 001.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
O/o.Superintendent of Police,
Thiruvallur – 602 001.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
(Law and Order),
Taluk Police Station,
Thiruvalur – 602 001.
- 6.The Joint Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Public, Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 9.
- 7.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.63 of 2022

S.VAIDYANATHAN, J.
and
A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

nsd

H.C.P.No.63 of 2022

11.07.2022