



H.C.P.No.991 of 2021

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 28.02.2022

Coram

The Honourable Mr. Justice **P.N.PRAKASH**
and
The Honourable Mr. Justice **A.A.NAKKIRAN**

H.C.P.No.991 of 2021

Sindhu

.. Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.State of Tamil Nadu represented by
The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate of
Villupuram District, Villupuram.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Vellore.
- 4.The Superintendent of Police,
Villupuram District, Villupuram.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Mailam Police Station,
Villupuram District.

.. Respondents



H.C.P.No.991 of 2021

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the entire records pertaining to the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent in Rc.No.C2/12688/2021 dated 27.05.2021 and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's husband viz., Yuvaraj @ Danie @ Santhosh, aged about 28 years, who is now confined in the Central Prison, Vellore, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Vinothkumar for
Mr.A.Rawther Naina Mohamed
For Respondents : Mr.M.Babu Muthumeeran
Addl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu Yuvaraj @ Danie @ Santhosh, aged about 28 years, son of Kumar. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Rc.No.C2/12688/2021 dated 27.05.2021, 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.



H.C.P.No.991 of 2021

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 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.991 of 2021

WEB COPY

5. The Detention Order in question was passed on 27.05.2021. The petitioner made a representation on 19.06.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 22.06.2021. The remarks were duly received on 09.07.2021. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 09.08.2021.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 17 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which, 4 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 13 days in submitting the remarks.

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.



H.C.P.No.991 of 2021

WEB COPY

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 13 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority. 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 Rc.No.C2/12688/2021 dated 27.05.2021, passed



H.C.P.No.991 of 2021

by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Yuvaraj @
Danie @ Santhosh, aged about 28 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.) (A.A.N.,J.)
28.02.2022

Index: Yes/No
nsd



H.C.P.No.991 of 2021

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate of
Villupuram District, Villupuram.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Vellore.
- 4.The Superintendent of Police,
Villupuram District, Villupuram.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Mailam Police Station,
Villupuram District.
- 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.991 of 2021

P.N.PRAKASH,J.
and
A.A.NAKKIRAN,J.

nsd

H.C.P.No.991 of 2021

28.02.2022