



WEB COPY



HCP No.955 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 21.11.2022

Coram

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH
and
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN**

H.C.P.No.955 of 2022

Govindharaj
S/o.Ramakrishnan

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
represented by its
Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Prohibition and Excise Department (Home),
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Mayiladuthurai,
Mayiladuthurai District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Mayiladuthurai District,
Mayiladuthurai.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Special Prison for Women,
Thiruchirapalli.



HCP No.955 of 2022

5. The Inspector of Police,
Anaikaranchatram Police Station,
Mayiladuthurai District.

... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records pertaining to the detention order dated 03.05.2022 in C.O.C.No.13/2022 passed by the second respondent and issue direction to produce the detenu, namely, Indhirani W/o.Arivazhagan, aged 42 years, presently confined at Special Prison for Women, Thiruchirapalli, before this Court and set her at liberty forthwith and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.Swami Subramanian
For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the brother of the detenu, Indhirani W/o.Arivazhagan, aged 42 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C.O.C.No.13/2022 dated 03.05.2022, holding 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.



HCP No.955 of 2022

2. We have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor 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. 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.955 of 2022

5. The Detention Order in question was passed on 03.05.2022. The petitioner made a representation dated 12.05.2022. The Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 30.07.2022.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 2 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority. There was a delay of 71 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Home, P&E after the Deputy Secretary dealt with it, of which 21 days were Government holidays. Hence, there was inordinate delay of 50 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.955 of 2022

8. In **Sumaiya vs. The Secretary to Government (2007 (2) MWN**

WEB COPY

(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 2 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 50 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 C.O.C.No.13/2022 dated 03.05.2022, passed by the second



HCP No.955 of 2022

respondent is set aside. The detenue, viz., Indhirani W/o.Arivazhagan, aged 42 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless her detention is required in connection with any other case.

[PNP, J.] [SM, J.]
21.11.2022

Index: Yes/No
gm

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Prohibition and Excise Department (Home),
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Mayiladuthurai,
Mayiladuthurai District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Mayiladuthurai District,
Mayiladuthurai.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Special Prison for Women,
Thiruchirapalli.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Anaikaranchatram Police Station,
Mayiladuthurai District.



HCP No.955 of 2022

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



HCP No.955 of 2022

P.N.PRAKASH, J.
and
SUNDER MOHAN, J.

gm

H.C.P.No.955 of 2022

21.11.2022