



*H.C.P.(MD)No.1053 of 2022*

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

**DATED : 01.12.2022**

**CORAM:**

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH**

**and**

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH**

**H.C.P.(MD)No.1053 of 2022**

S.Subbaiah

.. Petitioner

**Vs.**

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,  
Tirunelveli,  
Tirunelveli District.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison,  
Palayamkottai,  
Tirunelveli,  
Tirunelveli District.

.. Respondents



*H.C.P.(MD)No.1053 of 2022*

**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 order of detention passed in No.50/BCDFGISSSV/2022, dated 16.05.2022 by the second respondent and set aside the same and consequently directing the respondents to produce the detenu Chandrasekar @ Sekar, son of Subbaiah, aged about 39 years, before this Court, who is confined in Central Prison, Palayamkottai, and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.C.Herold Singh

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

### **ORDER**

[Order of the Court was made by **N.ANAND VENKATESH, J.**]

The petitioner is the father of the detenu viz., Chandrasekar @ Sekar, son of Subaiah, aged about 39 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in No.50/BCDFGISSSV/2022, dated 16.05.2022, 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.



*H.C.P.(MD)No.1053 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.1053 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 16.05.2022.

The petitioner made a representation dated 27.05.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 30.05.2022. The remarks were duly received on -Nil-. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 14.06.2022.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 4 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 2 days were a Government holiday and hence there was an inordinate delay of 2 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on -Nil- and there was a delay of 7 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 a Government Holiday and hence, there



*H.C.P.(MD)No.1053 of 2022*

was inordinate delay of 5 days in considering the representation.

WEB COPY

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.1053 of 2022*

WEB COPY

10. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 2 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 5 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 No.50/BCDFGISSSV/2022, dated 16.05.2022, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Chandrasekar @ Sekar, son of Subaiah, aged about 39 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.)**

**01.12.2022**

Index : Yes/No  
Internet : Yes  
rm



*H.C.P.(MD)No.1053 of 2022*

WEB COPY Copy to

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,  
State of Tamil Nadu,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Fort St. George,  
Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,  
Tirunelveli,  
Tirunelveli District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison,  
Palayamkottai,  
Tirunelveli,  
Tirunelveli District.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,  
Madurai.



WEB COPY



*H.C.P.(MD)No.1053 of 2022*

**M.S.RAMESH,J.**

**and**

**N.ANAND VENKATESH, J.**

rm

**H.C.P.(MD)No.1053 of 2022**

01.12.2022