



H.C.P.(MD)No.665 of 2022

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 06.09.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE J. NISHA BANU

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH

H.C.P.(MD)No.665 of 2022

Suresh

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thanjavur District,
Thanjavur.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Special Prison for Women,
Tiruchirappalli.

.. Respondents

PRAYER: 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



H.C.P.(MD)No.665 of 2022

proceedings in P.D.No.13/2022 dated 10.02.2022 in detaining the detenue under Section 2(b) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 as a "Boot Legger" and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenue namely, Mariyammal, wife of Suresh, female, aged about 31 years, who is detained at the Special Prison for Women, Tiruchirappalli, before this Court and set her at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.M.Karunakaran

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the husband of the detenue viz., Mariyammal, wife of Suresh, female, aged about 31 years. The detenue has been detained by the second respondent by his order in P.D. No.13/2022 dated 10.02.2022 holding him to be a "Boot Legger", as contemplated under Section 2(b) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.



H.C.P.(MD)No.665 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.665 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 Detention Order in question was passed on 10.02.2022. The petitioner made a representation dated 25.03.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 29.03.2022. The remarks were duly received on 05.04.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 30.07.2022.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 6 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 2 days were Government holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 4 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 05.04.2022 and there was a delay of 114 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, 36 days were a Government Holiday and



H.C.P.(MD)No.665 of 2022

hence, there was inordinate delay of 78 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.

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.



H.C.P.(MD)No.665 of 2022

WEB COPY

10. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 4 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 78 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 P.D.No.13/2022 dated 10.02.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detinue, viz., Mariyammal, wife of Suresh, female, aged about 31 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless her detention is required in connection with any other case.

(J.N.B., J.) (N.A.V., J.)
06.09.2022

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes
rm

Page 6 of 8



H.C.P.(MD)No.665 of 2022

WEB COPY Copy to

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thanjavur District,
Thanjavur.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Special Prison for Women,
Tiruchirappalli.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.665 of 2022

J.NISHA BANU,J.

and

N.ANAND VENKATESH, J.

rm

H.C.P.(MD)No.665 of 2022

06.09.2022