



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 14.03.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SUBRAMANIAN

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

H.C.P. (MD) No.1495 of 2021

WEB COPY

Muthaiah @ Raj

... Petitioner/Father of the detenu

Vs.

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 9.

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

3.The Inspector of Police,
Thalaiyuthu Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.

4.The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli District.

...Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, directing the respondents herein to produce the detenu Vijay, Son of Muthaiah @ Raj, aged about 18 years, who has been termed as Goonda, who is now detained at Central Prison, Palayamkottai before this Court and to call for the entire records in relation to the impugned detention order in M.H.S.Confdl.No.91 of 2021, dated 25.07.2021 passed by the second respondent and to set aside the same and set the detenu at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.S.Jeyakarthik
For Respondents : Mr.T.Senthil Kumar,
Additional Public Prosecutor.

O R D E R

R.SUBRAMANIAN, J.

AND

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.

The Petitioner is the father of the detenu, namely, Vijay,
Son of Muthaiah @ Raj, aged about 18 years. The detenu has been

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



detained by the second respondent by his order in M.H.S.Confdl.No.91 of 2021, dated 25.07.2021, 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 25.07.2021. The petitioner made a representation, dated 27.08.2021 and the same was received on 31.08.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 31.08.2021. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed an order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 30.11.2021. Though the representation, dated 27.08.2021 was received on 31.08.2021, it was rejected only on 30.11.2021 with a delay of 22 days, after excluding the Government Holidays of 11 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 22 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.91 of 2021, dated 25.07.2021, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Vijay, Son of Muthaiah @ Raj, aged about 18 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS-III)

// True Copy //

/ /2022


Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

rm

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,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 9.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
Thalaiyuthu Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.



4.The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli District.

5. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law & Order), Fort Saint George, Chennai

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

+1 CC to M/s.M.S.JEYAKARTHIK, Advocate (SR-11944[F] dated
14/03/2022)

ORDER MADE IN
H.C.P (MD) .No.1495 of 2021
14.03.2022

sb (CO)
TR(24.03.2022) 4P 8C