



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.886 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 15.11.2022

Coram

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

H.C.P.No.886 of 2022

Sumithra

.. Petitioner

Vs

- 1.The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tirupathur District, Tirupathur – 635 601.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Tirupathur District, Tirupathur.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Special Prison for Women,
Vellore – 2.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Vaniyambadi Police Station,
Tirupathur District.

.. Respondents



H.C.P.No.886 of 2022

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus call for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the second respondent dated 17.05.2022 in C3/D.O.NO.29/2022 against the petitioner's mother Mageswari, female, aged 41 years, W/o.Srinivasan, who is confined at the Central Prison, Vellore and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detainee before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Balaji

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the daughter of the detainee Mageswari, female, aged 41 years, W/o.Srinivasan. The detainee has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C3/D.O.NO.29/2022 dated 17.05.2022, holding her to be a "Bootlegger", as contemplated under Section 2(b) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.



H.C.P.No.886 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 detainee 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 detainee 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.886 of 2022

WEB COPY

5. The Detention Order in question was passed on 17.05.2022. A representation was made on behalf of the detainee on 27.05.2022. Thereafter, the representation was received by the Government on 31.05.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the representation on 30.07.2022.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 53 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, 15 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was an inordinate delay of 38 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 detainee.



H.C.P.No.886 of 2022

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 detainee 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 38 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



H.C.P.No.886 of 2022

order of detention in C3/D.O.NO.29/2022 dated 17.05.2022, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenue, viz. Mageswari, female, aged 41 years, W/o.Srinivasan, is directed to be released forthwith unless her detention is required in connection with any other case.

(P.N.P., J.) (TKRJ)
15.11.2022

Index: Yes/No
nsd



H.C.P.No.886 of 2022

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tirupathur District, Tirupathur – 635 601.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Tirupathur District, Tirupathur.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Special Prison for Women,
Vellore – 2.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Vaniyambadi Police Station,
Tirupathur 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.886 of 2022

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

nsd

H.C.P.No.886 of 2022

15.11.2022