



*H.C.P.(MD)No.1105 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.1105 of 2022**

Karthick

.. Petitioner

**Vs.**

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

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

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

.. Respondents



*H.C.P.(MD)No.1105 of 2022*

**PRAYER:** Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the entire records connected with the detention order passed in M.H.S.Confdl.No.56 of 2022, dated 16.05.2022 on the file of the second respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu or body of the detenu namely, Karthick, son of Thangasamy, aged about 33 years, now detained at the Central Prison, Palayamkottai, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Pragalathan

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 detenu viz., Karthick, son of Thangasamy, aged about 33 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in M.H.S.Confdl.No.56 of 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.1105 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.1105 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 29.06.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 05.07.2022. The remarks were duly received on -Nil-. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 19.07.2022.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 9 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 7 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 3 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



WEB COPY

7. In **Rekha vs. State of Tamil Nadu (2011 (5) SCC 244)**, the

8. In **Sumaiya vs. The Secretary to Government (2007 (2))**

**9. In Tara Chand vs. State of Rajasthan and others, reported**



*H.C.P.(MD)No.1105 of 2022*

WEB COPY

10. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 7 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 1 day 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 M.H.S.Confdl.No.56 of 2022, dated 16.05.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Karthick, son of Thangasamy, aged about 33 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.1105 of 2022*

WEB COPY Copy to

- 1.The Additional Secretary to Government,  
State of Tamil Nadu,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Secretariat,  
Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,  
Tenkasi District,  
Tenkasi.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison,  
Palayamkottai,  
Tirunelveli.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,  
Madurai.



WEB COPY



*H.C.P.(MD)No.1105 of 2022*

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

**and**

**N.ANAND VENKATESH, J.**

rm

**H.C.P.(MD)No.1105 of 2022**

01.12.2022