



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 31.03.2022

CORAM:

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

H.C.P. (MD) No.1441 of 2021

Pechiammal

... Petitioner/Wife of the Detenu

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu

Rep. by its 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,
Cuddalore,
Cuddalore District.

...Respondents

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.129/2021 dated 27.08.2021 passed by the second respondent on her husband namely, Kannan @ Kandasamy @ Kannabiran, S/o.Murugandi, aged about 42 years, has been detained and branded as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Boot-leggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Sexual Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act 1982 (Tamil Nadu) Act 14/1982) and confined at the Central Prison, Cuddalore, Cuddalore District and set aside the same and set the detenu at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Thalaimutharasu
For Respondents : Mr.S.Ravi,
Additional Public Prosecutor.



O R D E R

R.SUBRAMANIAN, J.

AND

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.

WEB COPY

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu, namely, Kannan @ Kandasamy @ Kannabiran, S/o.Murugandi, aged about 42 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his proceedings in M.H.S.Confdl No.129/2021 dated 27.08.2021 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 27.08.2021. The petitioner made a representation dated 13.09.2021 and the same was received on 24.09.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 24.09.2021. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 02.12.2021. Though the representation dated 13.09.2021, was received on 24.09.2021, it was rejected only on 02.12.2021 with the delay of 33 days, after excluding the Government Holidays of 21 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.

9. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an unexplained delay of 33 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.129/2021 dated 27.08.2021 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Kannan @ Kandasamy @ Kannabiran, S/o.Murugandi, aged about 42 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (T&P)

// True Copy //

/ /2022

Sub Assistant Registrar (CS)

rm

To

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

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

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>



3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Cuddalore,
Cuddalore District.

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

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

**H.C.P. (MD) No.1441 of 2021
31.03.2022**

PA(07.04.2022) 4P 6C