



H.C.P.(MD) No.443 of 2022

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 18.08.2022

CORAM:

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

H.C.P.(MD) No.443 of 2022

Bhavana

... Petitioner

-VS-

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

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



H.C.P.(MD) No.443 of 2022

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli,
Tiruchirappalli.

... 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 C.No.07/Detention/C.P.O/T.C/2022 dated 10.01.2022 on the file of the second respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu or body of the detenu namely the petitioner's husband Mahendrakumar S/o.Dhayaram, aged 25 years, now detained at the central prison, Tiruchirappalli, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.Na.Manimaran
Ms.D.Pandeeswari

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Mahendrakumar, aged about 25 years, son of Dhayaram. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his detention order in C.No.07/Detention/C.P.O/T.C/2022 dated 10.01.2022, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) of



H.C.P.(MD) No.443 of 2022

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. 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



5. The Detention Order in question was passed on 10.01.2022. The petitioner made a representation on 16.01.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 17.02.2022. The remarks were duly received on 24.02.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 19.04.2022.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 24.02.2022 and there was a delay of 53 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 18 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was an inordinate delay of 35 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



H.C.P.(MD) No.443 of 2022

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 35 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.443 of 2022

WEB COPY

11. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in C.No.07/Detention/C.P.O/T.C/2022 dated 10.01.2022, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Mahendrakumar, aged about 25 years, son of Dhayaram, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[P.N.P., J.] [R.H., J.]
18.08.2022

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
pkn

To:

1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.



H.C.P.(MD) No.443 of 2022

WEB COPY

- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tiruchirappalli City, Tiruchirappalli.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli,
Tiruchirappalli.
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.443 of 2022

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

pkn

H.C.P.(MD) No.443 of 2022

18.08.2022