



HCP(MD)No.524 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 26.08.2022

CORAM

The Honourable Mr. Justice **P.N.PRAKASH**
and
The Honourable Mrs. Justice **R.HEMALATHA**

H.C.P.(MD)No.524 of 2022

Dhaya @ Dhayanithi

... Petitioner/Detenu

Vs

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tiruchirappalli City, Tiruchirappalli.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli.

... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records pertaining to the impugned detention order passed by the second respondent made in his proceedings in C.No.82/Detention/C.P.O/T.C/2021 dated 28.12.2021 in detaining the detenu under Section 2(f) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 as a Goonda



HCP(MD)No.524 of 2022

and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the Detenu namely Dhaya @ Dhayanithi, S/o.Thangaraj, Male, aged about 21 years, who is detained in Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Joseph Jerry
For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by **P.N.PRAKASH, J.**]

The petitioner is the father of the detenu viz., Dhaya @ Dhayanithi, aged about 21 years, S/o.Thangaraj. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C.No.82/Detention/C.P.O/T.C/2021 dated 28.12.2021 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.

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.



HCP(MD)No.524 of 2022

WEB COPY

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.

5. The Detention Order in question was passed on 28.12.2021. The petitioner made a representation dated Nil. Thereafter, remarks were called



HCP(MD)No.524 of 2022

for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 14.03.2022. The remarks were duly received on 18.03.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 23.05.2022.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 3 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which - days were Government holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 3 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 18.03.2022 and there was a delay of 65 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, 23 days were a Government Holiday and hence, there was inordinate delay of 42 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



HCP(MD)No.524 of 2022

alleged activities undertaken by the detenu.

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 of 3 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 42 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.



HCP(MD)No.524 of 2022

11. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in C.No.82/Detention/C.P.O/T.C/2021 dated 28.12.2021 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Dhaya @ Dhayanithi, S/o.Thangaraj, aged about 21 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.)
26.08.2022

Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes

RR

To

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tiruchirappalli City, Tiruchirappalli.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.524 of 2022

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

RR

H.C.P.(MD)No.524 of 2022

26.08.2022