



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.80 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 05.09.2022

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MRS JUSTICE J. NISHA BANU
AND
THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH

H.C.P.(MD)No.80 of 2022

Fathima Kani

.. Petitioner /Mother of the
detenu

Vs.

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep by the Additional Chief Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort. St. George, Chennai-19.
- 2.The District Collector & District Magistrate,
Dindigul District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Madurai.

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records relating to the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent in Detention Order No.117/2021 dated 02.12.2021 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu namely Ashik Mohamed @ Al Ashik, S/o.Sowkath Ali aged about 28 years now detained at Central Prison, Madurai, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.



HCP(MD)No.80 of 2022

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Venkatesh
For Respondents : Mr.S.Ravi
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

J. NISHA BANU,J.
and
N. ANAND VENKATESH,J.

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu viz., Ashik Mohamed @ Al Ashik, aged about 28 years, S/o.Sowkath Ali. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Detention Order No.117/2021 dated 02.12.2021 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.

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



HCP(MD)No.80 of 2022

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 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 02.12.2021. The petitioner made a representation dated 18.12.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 07.01.2022. The remarks were duly received on 28.01.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's



HCP(MD)No.80 of 2022

representation on 20.04.2022.

WEB COPY

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 20 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 10 days were Government holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 10 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 28.01.2022 and there was a delay of 90 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, 27 days were a Government Holiday and hence, there was inordinate delay of 73 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**



HCP(MD)No.80 of 2022

(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 10 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 73 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.

11. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Detention Order No.117/2021 dated 02.12.2021 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Ashik Mohammed @ Al



HCP(MD)No.80 of 2022

Ashik S/o.Sowkath Ali, aged about 28 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

(J.N.B.,J.) (N.A.V.,J.)
05.09.2022

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes

RR

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort. St. George, Chennai-19.
- 2.The District Collector & District Magistrate,
Dindigul District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Madurai.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



HCP(MD)No.80 of 2022

**J. NISHA BANU,J.
and
N. ANAND VENKATESH,J.**

RR

H.C.P.(MD)No.80 of 2022

05.09.2022