



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 10.03.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SUBRAMANIAN
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

H.C.P. (MD) No.1265 of 2021

Ramesh Aravinth @ Kudal Kulampu ... Petitioner/Detenu

Vs.

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.
 2. The District Magistrate and Director Collector,
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector,
Pudukottai District.
 3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Trichy Central Prison,
Trichy 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, connected with the detention order of the second respondent in P.D.O.No.43/2021 dated 30.07.2021 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Ramesh Aravinth @ Kudal Kulampu, son of Kamaraj, aged about 31 years, now confining at Trichy Central Prison before this Honourable Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Alagumani
For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar,
Additional Public Prosecutor.

O R D E R

R.SUBRAMANIAN, J.
AND
N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.

The Petitioner is the detenu, namely, Ramesh Aravinth @ Kudal Kulampu, son of Kamaraj, aged about 31 years. The detenu



has been detained by the second respondent by his order in P.D.O.No.43/2021 dated 30.07.2021, 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 30.07.2021. The petitioner made a representation, dated 21.08.2021 and the same was received on 26.08.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 26.08.2021 and the remarks were received on 06.10.2021, in which, there is a delay of 26 days, after excluding the Government Holidays of 14 days. Thereafter, the Minister for Electricity, Prohibition and Excise has dealt with the representation on 12.10.2021. Thereafter, the petitioner's representation was rejected on 28.10.2021, in which, there is a delay of 9 days, after excluding the Government Holidays of 7 days. Thus there is a delay of 35 days in considering the representation which 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.

9. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an unexplained delay of 35 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 P.D.O.No.43/2021 dated 30.07.2021, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Ramesh Aravinth @ Kudal Kulampu, son of Kamaraj, aged about 31 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (AD-I)

// True Copy //

/ /2022

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

pm

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,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.



2. The District Magistrate and Director Collector,
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector,
Pudukottai District.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Trichy Central Prison,
Trichy District.
4. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law & Order),
Fort St.George, Chennai.
5. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

ORDER MADE IN
H.C.P (MD) .No.1265 of 2021
10.03.2022

USK/22.03.2022/4P/6C