



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 21.01.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE R.HEMALATHA

H.C.P.NO. 835 OF 2021

Dolly Kumari

...Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu rep.
By its Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector and
The District Magistrate,
Krishnagiri District,
Krishnagiri.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Krishnagiri District,
Krishnagiri.
4. The Inspector of Police,
Hudco Police Station,
Hosur,
Krishnagiri District.
5. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Salem.

...Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS to call for the records of the second respondent herein pertaining to the detention order made in S.C.No.06/2021 dated 16.04.2021 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body of the detenu Mr.Arjun Prasad @ Ajay Kumar @ Rajeev Kumar @ Rajeev Yadav @ Raj Kumar Yadhave, son of Ram Nandhan Prasad, aged about 33 years, now detained in Central Prison, Salem, before this Hon'ble Court and set the detenu at liberty forthwith.



WEB COPY

For petitioner : Mr.M.P.Saravanan
For respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj,
Additional Public Prosecutor.

O R D E R

[R.HEMALATHA, J.]


The petitioner is the wife of the detenu, Mr.Arjun Prasad @ Ajay Kumar @ Rajeev Kumar @ Rajeev Yadav @ Raj Kumar Yadhav, S/o.Ram Nandhan Prasad, aged 33 years. The detenu has been detained by the 2nd respondent by his order dated 16.04.2021 in S.C.No.06/2021, 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 filed his counter affidavit and strongly 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 16.04.2021. The petitioner made a representation on 20.05.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 24.05.2021. The remarks were duly received on 22.06.2021. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and



7. In *Rekha Vs. State of Tamil Nadu* [2011 (5) SCC 244], the Hon'ble 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.

9. In Tara Chand Vs. State of Rajasthan and others, reported in [1980 (2) SCC 321], the Hon'ble 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 21 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and an unexplained delay of 33 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 S.C.No.06/2021, dated 16.04.2021, passed by the 2nd respondent is set aside. The detenu Mr.Arjun Prasad @ Ajay Kumar @ Rajeev Kumar @ Rajeev Yadav @ Raj Kumar Yadhav, male, aged 33 years, S/o. Ram Nandhan Prasad, is directed to be



WEB COPY

released forthwith, unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS-IX)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

mtl

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector and
The District Magistrate,
Krishnagiri District,
Krishnagiri.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Krishnagiri District,
Krishnagiri.
4. The Inspector of Police,
Hudco Police Station,
Hosur,
Krishnagiri District.
5. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Salem.
6. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public, Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
7. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.835 of 2021

KV(CO)
RLP(24/01/2022)