



H.C.P.(MD) No.72 of 2022

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 11.07.2022

CORAM:

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

H.C.P.(MD) No.72 of 2022

Kalanjiyam

... Petitioner

-VS-

1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tiruchirappalli City, Tiruchirappalli.

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Trichy.



H.C.P.(MD) No. 72 of 2022

WEB COPY

4. The Inspector of Police,
Sessions Court Police Station,
Tiruchirappalli City.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a writ of habeas corpus to call for the order dated 18.12.2021 made in C.No. 76/Detention/C.P.O./T.C./2021 on the file of the second respondent herein, branding the petitioner's son/detenu by name Suresh S/o.Ganesan, aged about 28 years as GOONDA who is now confined at Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli, Tiruchirappalli District and quash the impugned order of detention and set him at liberty by producing him before this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Ebenezer Charles

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu viz., Suresh, aged about 28 years, son of Ganesan. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his Detention Order in C.No.76/Detention/C.P.O./T.C./2021 dated 18.12.2021, 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. 72 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 by filing 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.



H.C.P.(MD) No. 72 of 2022

WEB COPY

5. The Detention Order in question was passed on 18.12.2021. The petitioner made a representation on 10.01.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 19.01.2022. The remarks were duly received on 19.01.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 16.06.2022.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 146 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 45 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was inordinate delay of 101 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.



H.C.P.(MD) No. 72 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 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 unexplained delay of 101 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.



H.C.P.(MD) No.72 of 2022

WEB COPY

In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in C.No.76/Detention/C.P.O./T.C./2021 dated 18.12.2021, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Suresh, aged about 28 years, son of Ganesan, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[P.N.P., J.] [R.H., J.]
11.07.2022

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
pkn

To:

1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tiruchirappalli City, Tiruchirappalli.



H.C.P.(MD) No. 72 of 2022

WEB COPY

3. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Trichy.
4. The Inspector of Police,
Sessions Court Police Station,
Tiruchirappalli City.
5. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.72 of 2022

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

pkn

H.C.P.(MD) No.72 of 2022

11.07.2022