

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: **16.09.2022**

CORAM

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

H.C.P.(MD)No.318 of 2022

Pandurangan

... Petitioner / Father of Detenue

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Home Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.

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

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.

...Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the Detention order passed by the 2nd respondent in his proceedings C.No. 20/Detention / C.P.O./T.C/ 2022, dated 08.02.2022 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the person or body of the Detenue namely, Sathianarayanan @ Speed Sathiya, S/o.Pandurengan, aged 29 years (now detained at Central Prison, Trichy) before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Ananda Kumar
For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar,
Additional Public Prosecutor.

ORDER

J. NISHA BANU,J.

and

N. ANAND VENKATESH,J.

The petitioner is the father of the detenu viz., Sathianarayanan @ Speed Sathiya, S/o.Pandurengan, aged 29 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C.No.20/Detention / C.P.O./T.C/ 2022, dated 08.02.2022, 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.

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 08.02.2022. The petitioner made a representation dated 19.02.2022. Thereafter, remarks were

called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 23.02.2022. The remarks were duly received on 28.02.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 20.04.2022.

6.It is the contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 28.02.2022 and there was a delay of 50 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 and hence, there was inordinate delay of 34 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.

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 34 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 C.No.20/Detention / C.P.O./T.C/ 2022, dated 08.02.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz.,

Sathianarayanan @ Speed Sathiya, S/o.Pandurengan, aged 29 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.)
16.09.2022

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes
sm

To:

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tirurchirappalli City, Tiruchirappalli.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

HCP(MD)No.318 of 2022

J. NISHA BANU,J.

and

N. ANAND VENKATESH,J.

sm

H.C.P.(MD)No.318 of 2022

16.09.2022