



HCP(MD)No.441 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 30.06.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH

and

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE R.VIJAYAKUMAR

H.C.P.(MD)No.441 of 2022

Muthulakshmi

: Petitioner

Vs.

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Madurai City,
Madurai.

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Madurai.



HCP(MD)No.441 of 2022

4.The Inspector of Police,
Thiruparankundram Police Station,
Madurai District.

: 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 second respondent in Detention Order No.66/BCDFGISSSV/2021 dated 20.11.2021 and to quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu, Karthickkumar, son of Nagarajan aged about 27 years before this Court and set him at liberty, now detained at Central Prison, Madurai.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Mahendrapathy

For Respondents : Mr.S.Ravi

Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

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

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Karthickkumar, aged about 27 years, son of Nagarajan. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in No.66/BCDFGISSSV/2021 dated 20.11.2021, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated



HCP(MD)No.441 of 2022

under Section 2(f) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.

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



HCP(MD)No.441 of 2022

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 20.11.2021. The remarks were duly received on 30.12.2021. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 16.06.2022.

6.It is the contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 30.12.2021 and there was a delay of 163 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 52 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was inordinate delay of 111 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.



HCP(MD)No.441 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 inordinate and unexplained delay 111 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 No.66/BCDFGISSSV/2021 dated 20.11.2021, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz.,



HCP(MD)No.441 of 2022

Karthickkumar, aged about 27 years, son of Nagarajan, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[P.N.P.J.] & [R.V.J.]

30.06.2022

Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes/No

MR



HCP(MD)No.441 of 2022

WEB COPY

To

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Madurai City,
Madurai.

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Madurai.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Thiruparankundram Police Station,
Madurai District.

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



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.441 of 2022

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

MR

ORDER MADE IN
H.C.P.(MD)No.441 of 2022

30.06.2022