



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 11.02.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SUBRAMANIAN

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

H.C.P(MD) No.1318 of 2021

WEB COPY

Esakki

... Petitioner/
Father of the Detenue

vs.

- 1.State of Tamil Nadu, rep. by
The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli-9.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli 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 in detention order passed in M.H.S.Confdl No.69/2021 dated 08.07.2021 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein and set aside the same as illegal and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's son namely Vengadasubramanian alias Vicky S/o.Esakki, male, aged 24 years, who is detained in Central Prison, Palayamkottai, Tirunelveli, before this Court and set him at liberty.


For Petitioner : Mr.M.Maharaja

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar
Additional Public Prosecutor.

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu, namely, Vengadasubramanian alias Vicky S/o.Esakki, aged 24 years. The



detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in M.H.S.Confdl No.69/2021 dated 08.07.2021, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.

WEB COPY

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 arguments 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 in 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 08.07.2021. The petitioner made his representation on 01.07.2021 and the same was received on 04.08.2021 and remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 04.08.2021 and remarks were received on 30.09.2021, in which, there is a delay of 38 days excluding the Government Holidays of 18 days. Ultimately, the petitioner's representation came to be rejected on 29.10.2021. Thus, there is a delay of 38 days in considering the petitioner's representations 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.

WEB COPY

9. In the present case, admittedly, there is an unexplained delay of 38 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 M.H.S.Confdl No.69/2021 dated 08.07.2021, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Vengadasubramanian alias Vicky S/o.Esakki, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-I)

// True Copy //

/ /2022

Sub Assistant Registrar (CS)

bala

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli-9.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli District.
- 4.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law & Order),
Fort St. George,
Chennai-9.



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

WEB COPY

H.C.P (MD) No.1318 of 2021
11.02.2022

RK(25/02/2022) 4P 6C