



**H.C.P.(MD) No.674 of 2022**

**BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT**

WEB COPY

DATED: 25.08.2022

Coram

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH  
AND  
THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE R.HEMALATHA**

**H.C.P.(MD) No.674 of 2022**

Lakshmi

... Petitioner

Vs.

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

2.The District Collector and  
District Magistrate,  
District Collector and District Magistrate's office,  
Thanjavur District.

3.The Superintendent of Police,  
Trichy Central Prison,  
Trichy District.

... Respondents

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 dated 27.01.2022 passed by the second respondent in P.D.No.10/2022 and



**H.C.P.(MD) No.674 of 2022**

quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Raja, son of Murugesan, aged 24 years, now detained as 'Goonda', who is presently undergoing detention in the Central Prison, Trichy, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Alagumani  
For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar,  
: Addl. Public Prosecutor

**ORDER**

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

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu viz., Raja, aged about 24 years, son of Murugesan. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his detention order in P.D.No.10/2022 dated 27.01.2022, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) of the 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



**H.C.P.(MD) No.674 of 2022**

have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.

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 27.01.2022. The



**H.C.P.(MD) No.674 of 2022**

petitioner made a representation on 25.04.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 04.05.2022.

The remarks were duly received on 17.05.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 24.05.2022.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 13 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 4 days were Government Holiday and hence there was a delay of 9 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 03.03.2022 and there was a delay of 6 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 2 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was a delay of 4 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



**H.C.P.(MD) No.674 of 2022**

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 9 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 4 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.



WEB COPY



**H.C.P.(MD) No.674 of 2022**

11. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in P.D.No.10/2022 dated 27.01.2022, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Raja, aged about 24 years, son of Murugesan, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

**(P.N.P.,J.) (R.H.,J.)**  
**25.08.2022**

Index: Yes/No  
nsd

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Fort St.George,  
Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and  
District Magistrate,  
District Collector and District Magistrate's office,  
Thanjavur District.



WEB COPY



**H.C.P.(MD) No.674 of 2022**

- 3.The Superintendent of Police,  
Trichy Central Prison,  
Trichy District.
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,  
Madurai.



WEB COPY



**H.C.P.(MD) No.674 of 2022**

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

**H.C.P.(MD) No.674 of 2022**

25.08.2022