



H.C.P.(MD)No.856 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.856 of 2022

A.Sutharlin Meri

.. Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Dindigul District,
Dindigul.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
Ambathurai Police Station,
Dindigul District.
(Crime No.14 of 2022)



H.C.P.(MD)No.856 of 2022

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Madurai.

.. Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to direct the respondents to produce the person or body of detenu namely, Arockiadass, son of Joseph, aged about 33/2022 years before this Court who is now detained in the Central Prison, Madurai, in pursuant to the detention order passed by the second respondent in Detention Order No.20/2022 dated 23.03.2022 and to call for the records and quash the same and release the detenu at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Mohideen Basha

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

ORDER

J.NISHA BANU, J.

and

N.ANAND VENKATESH, J.

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Arockiadass, son of Joseph, aged about 33 years . The detenu has been detained by the second



H.C.P.(MD)No.856 of 2022

respondent by his order in Detention Order No.20/2022 dated 23.03.2022 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.

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.



H.C.P.(MD)No.856 of 2022

WEB COPY

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 learned Additional Public Prosecutor, on instructions, submitted that the investigation was completed and final report was filed and it was taken on file by the Additional District Court, Dindigul, in S.C.No.84 of 2022.

6. The Detention Order in question was passed on 23.03.2022. The petitioner made a representation dated 24.03.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 07.04.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 22.04.2022.



H.C.P.(MD)No.856 of 2022

WEB COPY

7. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 21 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Electricity, Prohibition and Excise Department after the Deputy Secretary dealt with it, in which 8 days were Government Holidays, and hence there was an inordinate delay of 13 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,**



H.C.P.(MD)No.856 of 2022

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.

11. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 13 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.

12. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in No.20/2022 dated 23.03.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Arockiadass, son of Joseph, aged about 33 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



H.C.P.(MD)No.856 of 2022

WEB COPY Copy to

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Dindigul District,
Dindigul.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
Ambathurai Police Station,
Dindigul District.
(Crime No.14 of 2022)
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Madurai.
- 5.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.856 of 2022

J.NISHA BANU,J.

and

N.ANAND VENKATESH, J.

rm

H.C.P.(MD)No.856 of 2022

30.09.2022