



HCP(MD)No.1210 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 01.12.2022

CORAM

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

H.C.P.(MD)No.1210 of 2022

Suresh

... Petitioner / Detenu

Vs.

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

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

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

... Respondents



HCP(MD)No.1210 of 2022

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 passed in M.H.S.Confdl No.68/2022 dated 17.05.2022 on the file of the 2nd Respondent and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu or body of the detenu, namely Suresh, son of Murugan, aged about 21 years now detained at the Central Prison, Palayamkottai before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Pragalathan

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

ORDER

N. ANAND VENKATESH, J.

The petitioner is the detenu viz., Suresh, son of Murugan, aged about 21 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in M.H.S.Confdl No.68/2022 dated 17.05.2022 holding him to be a "Drug Offender", as contemplated under Section 2(e) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.



HCP(MD)No.1210 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 detenu and thus, there is no violation of the fundamental rights guaranteed under



HCP(MD)No.1210 of 2022

Articles 21 and 22 of the Constitution of India.

WEB COPY

5.The Detention Order in question was passed on 17.05.2022. The petitioner made a representation dated 29.06.2022. The representation received on 05.07.2022. The remarks were submitted on 18.07.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 20.07.2022.

6.It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 12 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 4 days were Government holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 8 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were submitted on 18.07.2022 and there was a delay of 1 day, in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Electricity, Prohibition and Excise Department after the Deputy Secretary dealt with it and hence, there was inordinate delay of 1 day in considering the representation.



HCP(MD)No.1210 of 2022

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.

10.In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and

unexplained delay of 8 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 1 day in considering the representation



HCP(MD)No.1210 of 2022

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.68/2022 dated 17.05.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Suresh, son of Murugan, aged about 21 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

PJL

To

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.



HCP(MD)No.1210 of 2022

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

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

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



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1210 of 2022

M. S. RAMESH,J.

and

N. ANAND VENKATESH,J.

PJL

H.C.P.(MD)No.1210 of 2022

01.12.2022