



H.C.P.(MD) No.347 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.347 of 2022

Barisha Banu

... Petitioner

-VS-

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector cum District Magistrate,
Dindigul District,Dindigul.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Madurai.



H.C.P.(MD) No.347 of 2022

WEB COPY

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

... 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 19.10.2021 made in Detention Order No.79 of 2021 passed by the second respondent and set aside the same by setting the detenu namely Latheef Moulana S/o.Raja Mohammed, aged about 21 years and set him at liberty, now detained at Central Prison, Madurai or his body before this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.J.William Christopher

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu viz., Latheef Moulana, aged about 21 years, son of Raja Mohammed. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his Detention Order in No.79 of 2021 dated 19.10.2021, 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.347 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. 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.347 of 2022

WEB COPY

5. The Detention Order in question was passed on 19.10.2021. The petitioner made a representation on 23.02.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 28.02.2022. The remarks were duly received on 04.03.2022. 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 40 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 14 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was inordinate delay of 26 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.347 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 26 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.347 of 2022

WEB COPY

In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Detention Order No.79 of 2021 dated 19.10.2021, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Latheef Moulana, aged about 21 years, son of Raja Mohammed, 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 Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
fort St.George,
Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector cum District Magistrate,
Dindigul District,Dindigul.



H.C.P.(MD) No.347 of 2022

WEB COPY

3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Madurai.
4. The Inspector of Police,
Taluk Police Station,
Dindigul.
5. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.347 of 2022

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

pkn

H.C.P.(MD) No.347 of 2022

11.07.2022