



H.C.P.(MD)No.623 of 2022

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 30.09.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE J. NISHA BANU

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH

H.C.P.(MD)No.623 of 2022

Mukesh

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu,

Rep. by The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,

Kanniyakumari District,
Nagercoil.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,

Central Prison,
Palayamkottai
Tirunelveli.

.. Respondents



H.C.P.(MD)No.623 of 2022

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the entire records connected with the detention order passed in P.D.No.14/2022, dated 22.03.2022 on the file of the of the second respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu or body of the detenu namely, Mukesh, son of Mohan, aged about 24 years, now detained at the Central Prison, Palayamkottai before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Pragalathan

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

J.NISHA BANU, J.
and
N.ANAND VENKATESH, J.

The petitioner is the detenu viz., Mukesh, son of Mohan, aged about 24 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in P.D.No.14/2022, dated 22.03.2022 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.623 of 2022

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 has been caused to the



H.C.P.(MD)No.623 of 2022

detenu and thus, there is no violation of the fundamental rights guaranteed under Articles 21 and 22 of the Constitution of India.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor, on instructions, submitted that the investigation has been completed and final report has already been filed before the Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil, and the same is yet to be taken on file.

6. The Detention Order in question was passed on 22.03.2022. The petitioner made a representation dated 05.04.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 18.04.2022. The remarks were duly received on 26.05.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 30.05.2022.

7. It is the contention of the petitioner that remarks were received on 26.05.2022 and there was a delay of 36 days, in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Electricity, Prohibition and



H.C.P.(MD)No.623 of 2022

Excise Department after the Deputy Secretary dealt with it, of which, 11 days were a Government Holiday and hence, there was inordinate delay of 25 days in considering the representation.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. 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.



H.C.P.(MD)No.623 of 2022

WEB COPY

11. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 25 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. There shall be a direction to the learned Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil, to immediately act upon the final report and proceed in accordance with law.

12. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in P.D.No.14/2022, dated 22.03.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Mukesh, son of Mohan, aged about 24 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

(J.N.B., J.) (N.A.V., J.)
30.09.2022

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes
rm

Page 6 of 8



H.C.P.(MD)No.623 of 2022

WEB COPY

Copy to

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Kanniyakumari District,
Nagercoil.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai
Tirunelveli.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.623 of 2022

J.NISHA BANU,J.

and

N.ANAND VENKATESH, J.

rm

H.C.P.(MD)No.623 of 2022

30.09.2022