



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.576 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 14.11.2022

Coram

The Honourable Mr. Justice **P.N.PRAKASH**
and
The Honourable Mr. Justice **RMT.TEEKAA RAMAN**

H.C.P.No.576 of 2022

K.Yellammal

.. Petitioner

Vs

1.State of Tamil Nadu represented by
its Secretary to Government,
Prohibition and Excise Department, (Home)
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Chennai City,
Vepery,
Chennai – 600 007.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Puzhal,
Chennai – 600 066.

4.The Inspector of Police,
E-1, Mylapore Police Station,
Chennai.

.. Respondents



H.C.P.No.576 of 2022

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus call for the records relating to the detenu's detention order passed by the second respondent in BCDFGISSSV No.32/2022 dated 04.03.2022 and set aside the same and produce the detenu TAMILARASAN @ MOTTAI, male, aged about 23 years, son of Kumar, now detained in the Central Prison, Puzhal, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Balasubramaniam

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Addl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Made by *P.N.PRAKASH, J.*)

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu TAMILARASAN @ MOTTAI, male, aged about 23 years, son of Kumar. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in BCDFGISSSV No.32/2022 dated 04.03.2022, 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.



H.C.P.No.576 of 2022

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 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.



H.C.P.No.576 of 2022

WEB COPY

5. The Detention Order in question was passed on 04.03.2022. A representation was made on behalf of the detenu on 04.04.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 06.04.2022. The remarks were duly received on 18.04.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the representation on 22.04.2022.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 12 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which, 6 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 6 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 18.04.2022 and there was a delay of 4 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, there was no Government Holiday, hence, there was an inordinate delay of 4 days in considering the representation.



H.C.P.No.576 of 2022

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 6 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 4 days in considering the



H.C.P.No.576 of 2022

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 BCDFGISSSV No.32/2022 dated 04.03.2022, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz. TAMILARASAN @ MOTTAI, male, aged about 23 years, son of Kumar, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

(P.N.P., J.) (TKRJ)
14.11.2022

Index: Yes/No
nsd



H.C.P.No.576 of 2022

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Prohibition and Excise Department, (Home)
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Chennai City, Vepery,
Chennai – 600 007.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai – 600 066.
- 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.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.576 of 2022

P.N.PRAKASH, J.
and
RMT.TEEKAA RAMAN, J.

nsd

H.C.P.No.576 of 2022

14.11.2022