



HCP(MD)No.326 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 04.07.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH

and

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE R.HEMALATHA

H.C.P.(MD)No.326 of 2022

Mariyammal

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Additional Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The District Collector cum District Magistrate,
Tenkasi District,
Tenkasi.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli,
Tirunelveli District.

.. Respondents



HCP(MD)No.326 of 2022

PRAYER: 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 impugned detention order passed by the second respondent in M.H.S.Confdl.No.67/2021 dated 26.11.2021 and to quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu, Shanmuganathan, son of Veluchamy, aged about 43 years, who is presently confined at Central Prison, Palayamkottai, Tirunelveli, before this Court, and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : M/s.M.Shema Daniel

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu viz., Shanmuganathan, son of Veluchamy, aged about 43 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in M.H.S.Confdl.No. 67/2021 dated 26.11.2021, 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.



HCP(MD)No.326 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 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



HCP(MD)No.326 of 2022

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 26.11.2021.

The petitioner made a representation dated -Nil-. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 09.03.2022. The remarks were duly received on 16.05.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 19.05.2022.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 65 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 23 days was a Government Holiday and hence there was an inordinate delay of 42 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 16.05.2022 and there is no delay in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Electricity, Prohibition and Excise Department after the Deputy Secretary dealt with it.



HCP(MD)No.326 of 2022

WEB COPY

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 42 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining



HCP(MD)No.326 of 2022

Authority but there is no delay 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 M.H.S.Confdl.No.67/2021 dated 26.11.2021, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Shanmuganathan, son of Veluchamy, aged about 43 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.)
04.07.2022

Index: Yes/No
Internet : Yes / No
RM



HCP(MD)No.326 of 2022

To

WEB COPY

- 1.The Additional Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector cum District Magistrate,
Tenkasi District,
Tenkasi.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli,
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.326 of 2022

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

RM

H.C.P.(MD)No.326 of 2022

04.07.2022