



HCP(MD)No.918 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 28.11.2022

CORAM

**THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH
AND
THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH**

H.C.P.(MD)No.918 of 2022

Parthiban

.. Petitioner /detenu

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by the Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George
Chennai-600 009.

2.The District Magistrate and District Collector
Virudhunagar District
Virudhunagar

3.The Inspector of Police,
M.Pudhupatti Police Station,
Virudhunagar District

4.The Superintendent
Central Prison,
Madurai

.. 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 order of detention passed by the 2nd respondent in his proceedings in CrI.M.P.No.



HCP(MD)No.918 of 2022

16/2022 (Goonda) dated 05.05.2022 and set aside the same and direct the respondents 1 to 3 to produce the detenu Parthiban, S/o.Mohan aged about 32 years, before this Court now confined in Central Prison, Madurai and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Jothi Babu

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by N. ANAND VENKATESH,J.)

The petitioner is the detenu viz., Parthiban aged about 32 years, S/o.Mohan. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in CrI.M.P.No.16/2022 (Goonda) dated 05.05.2022 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.

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. It is further submitted that investigation was completed in this case and final report has been filed on time and the same is pending before the Principal District Judge, Srivilliputhur, in SC No.129/2022.



HCP(MD)No.918 of 2022

5. The Detention Order in question was passed on 05.05.2022. The petitioner made a representation dated 23.05.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority. The remarks were duly received. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 15.06.2022.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 12 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, 4 days were Government Holidays and hence, there was inordinate delay of 8 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**



HCP(MD)No.918 of 2022

(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 8 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 Crl.M.P.No.16/2022 (Goonda) dated 05.05.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Parthiban S/o.Mohan, aged about 32 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

(M.S.R.,J.) (N.A.V.,J.)
28.11.2022

Internet : Yes
RR



HCP(MD)No.918 of 2022

To

1. The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat
Chennai-600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Virudhunagar District
Virudhunagar
3. The Inspector of Police,
M.Pudhupatti Police Station,
Virudhunagar District
4. The Superintendent
Central Prison,
Madurai
5. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.918 of 2022

M.S.RAMESH,J.
and
N. ANAND VENKATESH,J.

RR

H.C.P.(MD)No.918 of 2022

28.11.2022