



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 22.02.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SUBRAMANIAN

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

H.C.P. (MD) No.1158 of 2021

WEB COPY

Meenakshi ... Petitioner/Mother of the detenu
Vs.

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.

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

3.The Inspector of Police,
Parthibanoor Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.

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

...Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records pertaining to the detention order passed by the second respondent in S.R.No.43/Goonda/2021, dated 14.07.2021 and to quash the same and consequently to set the detenu by name M.Venkateswaran, son of Mari, (Male, aged 27 years) (TPDA No.7556), who is confined at Central Prison, Madurai and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Anand
For Respondents : Mr.T.Senthil Kumar,
Addl. Public Prosecutor.

O R D E R

R.SUBRAMANIAN, J.

AND

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu, namely, M.Venkateswaran, son of Mari, aged 27 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in S.R.No.43/Goonda/2021 dated 14.07.2021, 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 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 representations made by the petitioner were not considered on time and there was an inordinate and unexplained delay with regard to the same.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the Habeas Corpus Petition. 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 14.07.2021. The petitioner made a representation, dated 21.07.2021 and the same was received on 23.08.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 23.08.2021. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed an order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 20.10.2021. Though the representation, dated 21.07.2021 was received on 23.08.2021, it was rejected only on 20.10.2021 with a delay of 26 days, after excluding the Government Holidays of 16 days. The delay in considering the representation remains unexplained.

6. In ***Rekha vs. State of Tamil Nadu***, reported in **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.

7. In ***Sumaiya vs. The Secretary to Government***, reported in **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.



8. 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.

WEB COPY

9. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an unexplained delay of 26 days in considering the representation. The impugned detention order is, therefore, liable to be quashed.

10. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in S.R.No.43/Goonda/2021 dated 14.07.2021, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, M.Venkateswaran, son of Mari, aged 27 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-III)

// True Copy //

/ /2022

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

vsn

Note : In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the advocate/litigant concerned.

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Ramanathapuram District,
Ramanathapuram.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
Parthibanoor Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.



4.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and Order),
Fort. St.George,
Chennai-9

5.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Madurai,
Madurai District

6.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

ORDER MADE IN
H.C.P (MD) .No.1158 of 2021
22.02.2022

ARK (CO)
GC (05.03.2022) 4P 7C