



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.482 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 29.08.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH

and

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE R.HEMALATHA

H.C.P.(MD)No.482 of 2022

Shanthi

.. Petitioner/Wife of
the Detenu

Vs.

1. The State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by its Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600009.

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

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

.. Respondents

PRAYER: Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the
Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus,



H.C.P.(MD)No.482 of 2022

calling for the entire records, pertaining to the detention order passed by the second Respondent in M.H.S.Confdl.No.15/2022 dated 29.01.2022 and quash the same and direct the Respondents to produce the person or body of the detenu, by name, Kannan, son of Govindhan Chettiyar, aged 55 years, now detained as GOONDA at the Central Prison, Palayamkottai, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Vishnu
For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor.

ORDER

P.N.PRAKASH, J.

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu, viz., Kannan, aged 55 years, son of Govindhan Chettiyar. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in M.H.S.Confdl.No.15/2022 dated 29.01.2022 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.



H.C.P.(MD)No.482 of 2022

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 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.482 of 2022

5.The Detention Order in question was passed on 29.01.2022.

The petitioner made a representation on 08.03.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 11.03.2022. The remarks were duly received on 28.04.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 04.05.2022.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 47 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 15 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 32 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 28.04.2022, there was a delay of 5 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 3 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was inordinate delay of 2 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



H.C.P.(MD)No.482 of 2022

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 32 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 2 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.482 of 2022

11. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in M.H.S.Confdl.No.15/2022 dated 29.01.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Kannan, aged 55 years, son of Govindhan Chettiyar. is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[P.N.P.,J.] & [R.H.,J.]
29.08.2022

Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes/No

PJL

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600009.
2. The District Collector cum District Magistrate,
Tenkasi District,
Tenkasi.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.482 of 2022



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.482 of 2022

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

PJL

ORDER MADE IN
H.C.P.(MD)No.482 of 2022

29.08.2022