



H.C.P.No.934 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 15.12.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH
AND
THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH

H.C.P.No.934 of 2022

Meenakshi

Petitioner

v

- 1 The Additional Chief Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat
Chennai 600 009
- 2 The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai
Office of the Commissioner of Police (Goondas Section)
Vepery
Chennai 600 007
- 3 The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison – II, Puzhal
Chennai 600 006
- 4 The Inspector of Police
V-4, Rajamangalam Police Station
Chennai 600 099

Respondents



H.C.P.No.934 of 2022

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS calling for the entire records connected with the detention order of the second respondent in No.100/BCDFGISSSV/2022 dated 04.05.2022 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body and person of the petitioner's husband, viz. Vignesh @ Vicky @ Masi @ Amavasai, aged 28 years, S/o.Sekar, detained in the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For petitioner	Mr. B.M. Santharam
For respondents	Mr.R.Muniyapparaj Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Made by N.ANAND VENKATESH, J.]

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Vignesh @ Vicky @ Masi @ Amavasai, aged 28 years, S/o.Sekar. The detenu has been detained by the 2nd respondent by his order dated 04.05.2022 in No.100/BCDFGISSSV/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.

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.



H.C.P.No.934 of 2022

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 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 04.05.2022. The petitioner made a representation dated 22.05.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 14.06.2022.



H.C.P.No.934 of 2022

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 11 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister concerned, after the Deputy Secretary dealt with it, of which 4 days were Government holidays. Hence, there was inordinate delay of 7 days in considering the representation.

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.

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 Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that any inordinate and



H.C.P.No.934 of 2022

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 7 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister concerned. 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.100/BCDFGISSSV/2022 dated 04.05.2022, passed by the 2nd respondent is set aside. The detenu viz., Vignesh @ Vicky @ Masi @ Amavasai, aged 28 years, S/o.Sekar, is directed to be released forthwith, unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

gya

Issue order copy by 16.12.2022

[P.N.P., J.]

[N.A.V., J.]

15.12.2022



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.934 of 2022

P.N.PRAKASH, J.

AND

N. ANAND VENKATESH, J.

gya

To

1 The Additional Chief Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat
Chennai 600 009

2 The Joint Secretary to Government
Public, Law and Order Department
Secretariat, Chennai-9

3 The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai
Office of the Commissioner of Police (Goondas Section)
Vepery
Chennai 600 007

H.C.P. No.934 of 2022

4 The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison – II, Puzhal
Chennai 600 006

5 The Inspector of Police
V-4, Rajamangalam Police Station
Chennai 600 099

15.12.2022

6 The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras