



H.C.P.(MD) No.286 of 2022

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 25.08.2022

CORAM:

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

H.C.P.(MD) No.286 of 2022

Ganesamoorthi

... Petitioner

-VS-

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort.St.George, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector,
Dindigul District, Dindigul.
- 3.The Director General of Police,
Office of the Director General of Police,



H.C.P.(MD) No.286 of 2022

WEB COPY Beach Road, Chennai.

4.The Additional Director General of Police (CB-CID),
Office of the Additional Director General of Police,
Beach Road, Chennai.

5.The Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Superintendent of Police,
Dindigul District.

6.The Inspector of Police,
Dindigul Taluk Police Station,
Dindigul.

7.The Superintendent of Police,
Madurai Central Prison,
Madurai.

... 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 order passed in Detention Order No.07/2022 dated 26.01.2022 on the file of the second respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu namely, Ganesamoorthi S/o.Rajendran,



H.C.P.(MD) No.286 of 2022

WEB COPY

aged 23 years, now detained at the central prison, Madurai, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Alagumani

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the detenu viz., Ganesamoorthi, aged about 23 years, son of Rajendran. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his detention order in Detention Order No.07/2022 dated 26.01.2022, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) of the 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.286 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 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 26.01.2022. The petitioner made a representation on 16.02.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called



H.C.P.(MD) No.286 of 2022

WEB COPY

for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 22.02.2022. The remarks were duly received on 03.03.2022. 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 8 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 2 days were Government Holiday and hence there was a delay of 6 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 03.03.2022 and there was a delay of 43 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 16 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was an inordinate delay of 27 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



H.C.P.(MD) No.286 of 2022

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 6 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 27 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.286 of 2022

WEB COPY

11. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Detention Order No.07/2022 dated 26.01.2022, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Ganesamoorthi, aged about 23 years, son of Rajendran, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[P.N.P., J.] [R.H., J.]
25.08.2022

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
pkn

To:

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort.St.George, Chennai – 600 009.

2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector,
Dindigul District, Dindigul.



H.C.P.(MD) No.286 of 2022

WEB COPY

- 3.The Director General of Police,
Office of the Director General of Police,
Beach Road, Chennai.
- 4.The Additional Director General of Police (CB-CID),
Office of the Additional Director General of Police,
Beach Road, Chennai.
- 5.The Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Superintendent of Police,
Dindigul District.
- 6.The Inspector of Police,
Dindigul Taluk Police Station,
Dindigul.
- 7.The Superintendent of Police,
Madurai Central Prison,
Madurai.
8. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.286 of 2022

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

pkn

H.C.P.(MD) No.286 of 2022

25.08.2022