



HCP(MD)No.391 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

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.391 of 2022

Gnana Prakash @ Prakash

... Petitioner / Detenue

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



HCP(MD)No.391 of 2022

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 Prison,
Madurai Central Prison,
Madurai District.

...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 of the second respondent in Detention Order No.04 of 2022 dated 26.01.2022 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Gnana Prakash @ Prakash, S/o. Mariya Arockiadas aged about 34 years, now confining as 'Goonda' at Madurai Central Prison before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Alagumani

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar

Additional Public Prosecutor



HCP(MD)No.391 of 2022

ORDER

J. NISHA BANU,J.

and

N. ANAND VENKATESH,J.

The petitioner is the detenu viz., Gnana Prakash @ Prakash, S/o. Mariya Arockiadas aged about 34 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Detention Order No.04 of 2022 dated 26.01.2022 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 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




HCP(MD)No.391 of 2022

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.

5.The Detention Order in question was passed on 26.01.2022. The petitioner made a representation dated 05.03.2022. The remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 11.03.2022. The remarks were duly received on 23.03.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 23.05.2022.





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 8 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 36 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 Detention Order No.04 of 2022 dated 26.01.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Gnana Prakash @ Prakash, S/o. Mariya Arockiadas aged about 34 years, is directed to be



HCP(MD)No.391 of 2022

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 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,
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 Prison,
Madurai Central Prison, Madurai District.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.391 of 2022

J. NISHA BANU,J.

and

N. ANAND VENKATESH,J.

sm

8.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

H.C.P.(MD)No.391 of 2022

16.09.2022