WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
DATED : 09.03.2022
CORAM:
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SUBRAMANIAN
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR
H.C.P.(MD) No.1522 of 2021

K.Geetha ... Petitioner/
Mother of the Detenue

Vs.

1.Govt. of Tamil Nadu, Rep by
The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.

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

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli. ...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 2nd respondent in P.D.No.92/2021, dated 10.08.2021 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the petitioner son namely Rathish, Son of Kailasam, aged about 29 years now detained at Central Prison, Tiruchirapalli and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.J.Vishnu

For Respondents : Mr.T.Senthil Kumariah
Additional Public Prosecutor.

O R D E R

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

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu, namely, Rathish, S/o.Kailasam, aged about 29 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his proceedings in P.D.No.92/2021, dated 10.08.2021 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.

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

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 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 10.08.2021. The petitioner made a representation dated 20.09.2021 and the same was received on 23.09.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 23.09.2021. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 28.10.2021. Though the representation dated 20.09.2021 was received on 23.09.2021, it was rejected only on 28.10.2021 with the delay of 11 days, after excluding the Government Holidays of 9 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.

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

WEB COPY

9. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an unexplained delay of 11 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.No.92/2021, dated 10.08.2021 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Rathish, S/o.Kailasam, aged about 29 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar ()

// True Copy //

/ /2022

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

Ns

To

1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.

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

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.

4.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law & Order),
Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009.

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

H.C.P.(MD)No.1522 of 2021
09.03.2022

RK(25/03/2022) 3P 6C

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