

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.145 OF 2022

Vinitha

... Petitioner

.Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu represented by
The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai - 9.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai - 66.
4. The Inspector of Police,
E-1, Mylapore Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondents

PRAYER:-

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the entire records leading to the detention of the petitioner's husband Manikandan @ Dori Mani, S/o. Sundaram, male, aged 26 years, who is presently lodged in the Central Prison, Puzhal at Chennai and has been detained under Act 14/1982 as a "Goonda" vide detention order dated 31.12.2021 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein, made in No.400/BCDFGISSSV/2021 and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the body and person of the said detenu before this Court and thereafter, set him at liberty from the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Rajavelu

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu Manikandan @ Dori Mani, S/o.Sundaram, male, aged 26 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in No.400/BCDFGISSSV/2021 dated 31.12.2021, 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 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 of the detenu was not considered in time and there was an inordinate and unexplained delay.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the Habeas Corpus Petition. 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 31.12.2021. A representation was made on behalf of the detenu on 23.01.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 29.01.2022. The remarks were duly received on 25.02.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the representation on 20.04.2022.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 27 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which, 7 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 20 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 25.02.2022 and there was a delay of 54 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 36 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 20 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 36 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 No.400/BCDFGISSSV/2021 dated 31.12.2021, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Manikandan @ Dori Mani, S/o. Sundaram, male, aged 26 years, 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

nsd

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai - 9.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai - 66.
4. The Inspector of Police,
E-1, Mylapore Police Station,
Chennai.
5. The Joint Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Public, Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.NO.145 OF 2022

SKM(CO)
PBS/14/07/2022