



H.C.P.(MD) No.2 of 2022

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 01.07.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.VIJAYAKUMAR

H.C.P.(MD) No.2 of 2022

Ponnammal

... Petitioner

-VS-

1. State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Additional Chief Secretary
to Government,
Fort. St.George,
Chennai – 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tenkasi District, Tenkasi.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison, Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a writ of habeas corpus calling for the entire records connected with the detention



H.C.P.(MD) No.2 of 2022

WEB COPY

order passed in M.H.S.Confdl No.65/2021 dated 22.11.2021 on the file of the second respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu or body of the detenu namely the petitioner's son i.e., Christopher Raja, aged about 21 years, S/o.Innasimuthu, now detained at the Central Prison, Palayamkottai, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Pragalathan

For Respondents : Mr.S.Ravi,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu viz., Christopher Raja, aged about 21 years, son of Innasimuthu. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in M.H.S.Confdl No.65/2021 dated 22.11.2021, 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.(MD) No.2 of 2022

WEB COPY

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.



H.C.P.(MD) No.2 of 2022

WEB COPY

5. The Detention Order in question was passed on 22.11.2021. The petitioner made a representation on 28.12.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 04.01.2022. The remarks were duly received on 16.02.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 18.04.2022.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 42 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 15 days were Government Holiday and hence there was a delay of 27 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 16.02.2022 and there was an inordinate delay of 62 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Electricity, Prohibition and Excise Department after the Deputy Secretary dealt with it, of which 20 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was inordinate delay of 42 days in considering the representation.



H.C.P.(MD) No.2 of 2022

WEB COPY

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.

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.



H.C.P.(MD) No.2 of 2022

WEB COPY

10. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 27 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 42 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Electricity, 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 order of detention in M.H.S.Confdl No.65/2021 dated 22.11.2021, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Christopher Raja, aged about 21 years, son of Innasimuthu, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[P.N.P., J.] [R.V., J.]
01.07.2022

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
pkn



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.2 of 2022

To:

1. The Additional Chief Secretary,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Fort. St.George,
Chennai – 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tenkasi District, Tenkasi.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison, Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli.
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.2 of 2022

P.N.PRAKASH, J.
and
R.VIJAYAKUMAR, J.

pkn

H.C.P.(MD) No.2 of 2022

01.07.2022