



HCP No.836 of 2022

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the entire records of the second respondent herein in his proceedings No.47/BCDFGISSSV/2022 dated 31.03.2022 and set aside the same and consequently, direct the respondents to produce the body of the detenu C.P.Praveen Sagayaraj S/o.J.S.Clements Paulraj, aged about 29 years, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.S.Mangala Kumar

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Made by **P.N.PRAKASH, J.**]

The petitioner/detenu viz., Praveen Sagayaraj S/o.Clements Paulraj, aged about 29 years, has been detained by the second respondent by his order in No.47/BCDFGISSSV/2022 dated 31.03.2022, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.



HCP No.836 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 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 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.



HCP No.836 of 2022

5. The Detention Order in question was passed on 31.03.2022. The petitioner made a representation dated 28.04.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 03.06.2022.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 27 days in submitting the file, of which 9 days were Government holidays and hence, there was an inordinate delay of 18 days in submitting the file. There was a delay of 6 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Home, P&E after the Deputy Secretary dealt with it, of which 4 days were Government holidays. Hence, there was inordinate delay of 2 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.



HCP No.836 of 2022

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 18 days in submitting the file and unexplained delay of 2 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Home, P&E. 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.47/BCDFGISSSV/2022 dated 31.03.2022 passed by the



HCP No.836 of 2022

second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Praveen Sagayaraj

S/o.Clements Paulraj, aged about 29 years, is directed to be released

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

[PNP, J.] [NAV, J.]
19.12.2022

Index: Yes/No
gm

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Chennai.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prisons,
Central Jail, Puzhal, Chennai.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
Team - XXVIII, Job Racket Wing,
Central Crime Branch,
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



HCP No.836 of 2022

P.N.PRAKASH, J.
and
N.ANAND VENKATESH, J.

gm

H.C.P.No.836 of 2022

19.12.2022