



HCP(MD)No.171 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 03.08.2022

CORAM

The Honourable Mr. Justice **P.N.PRAKASH**
and
The Honourable Mrs. Justice **R.HEMALATHA**

H.C.P.(MD)No.178 of 2022

Pushpam

.. Petitioner / wife of the
detenu

Vs.

- 1.The Additional Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat
Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate
O/o.the District Collector and District Magistrate
Tiruchirappalli District
Tiruchirappalli.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
District Prison,
Pudukottai.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
Thiruverumbur Police Station,
Thiruverumbur.

.. Respondents



HCP(MD)No.171 of 2022

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records connected with the detention order in Cr.M.P.No.48/2021 dated 27.12.2021 on the file of the respondent No.2 and quash the same as illegal and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the petitioner's husband namely Kumar alias Selvakumar aged about 40 years son of Rengasamy, now confined at District Prison, Pudukottai before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.M.A.Jinnah

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Kumar @ Selvakumar, aged about 40 years, S/o.Rengasamy. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Cr.M.P.No.48/2021 dated 27.12.2021 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



HCP(MD)No.171 of 2022

have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.

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 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 27.12.2021. The



HCP(MD)No.171 of 2022

petitioner made a representation dated 05.01.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 07.01.2022. The remarks were duly received on 01.02.2022. 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 14 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 11 days were Government holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 3 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 01.02.2022 and there was a delay of 76 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, 24 days were a Government Holiday and hence, there was inordinate delay of 52 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



HCP(MD)No.171 of 2022

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.

10. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 3 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 52 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.



HCP(MD)No.171 of 2022

11. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Cr.M.P.No.48/2021 dated 27.12.2021 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Kumar @ Selvakumar, S/o.Rengasamy, aged about 40 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

(P.N.P.,J.) (R.H.,J.)
03.08.2022

Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes

RR

To

- 1.The Additional Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate
O/o.the District Collector and District Magistrate
Tiruchirappalli District, Tiruchirappalli.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Pudukottai.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
Thiruverumbur Police Station,
Thiruverumbur.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.171 of 2022

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

RR

H.C.P.(MD)No.178 of 2021

03.08.2022