



H.C.P.(MD) No.50 of 2022

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 15.07.2022

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH
and
THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE R.HEMALATHA**

H.C.P.(MD) No.50 of 2022

Kaleeswari

... Petitioner

-VS-

1.The State of Tamil Nadu
rep.by Principal Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St.George, Chennai-9

2.The Commissioner of Police
Madurai City, Madurai

3.The Inspector of Police
C2 Subramaniapuram
(Crime) Police Station
Madurai

4.The Superintendent
Central Prison
Madurai

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the entire records in detention order No. 53/BCDFGISSSV/2021, dated 27.10.2021, on the file of the second



H.C.P.(MD) No.50 of 2022

WEB COPY

respondent and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the body of the petitioner's son Karuppasami @ Mathan, aged about 20 years, son of Murugan, now confined in Central Prison, Madurai, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.Deenadhayan.S.

For Respondents : Mr.S.Ravi
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by R.HEMALATHA, J.]

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu viz., Karuppasami @ Mathan, aged about 20 years, son of Murugan. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order No.53/BCDFGISSSV/2021, dated 27.10.2021, 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.

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.(MD) No.50 of 2022

WEB COPY

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 a 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.

5. The detention order in question was passed on 27.10.2021. The petitioner made a representation on 11.11.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 15.11.2021. The remarks were duly received on 16.11.2021. Thereafter, the Government



H.C.P.(MD) No.50 of 2022

considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 30.11.2021.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 16.11.2021 and there was a delay of 12 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 02 days were Government holidays, hence, there was inordinate delay of 10 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.

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.



H.C.P.(MD) No.50 of 2022

WEB COPY

9. In *Tara Chand vs. State of Rajasthan and others* [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 10 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 No.53/BCDFGISSSV/2021, dated 27.10.2021, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Karuppasami @ Mathan, aged about 20 years, son of Murugan, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[P.N.P., J.]

[R.H., J.]

15.07.2022

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes / No

krk

Page 5 of 7



H.C.P.(MD) No.50 of 2022

WEB COPY

To:

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Fort St.George, Chennai-9.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Madurai City, Madurai.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
C2 Subramaniapuram,
(Crime) Police Station,
Madurai.
- 4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Madurai.
- 5.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.50 of 2022

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

krk

H.C.P.(MD) No.50 of 2022

15.07.2022