



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 13.06.2022

Coram

The Honourable Mr. Justice **P.N.PRAKASH**
and
The Honourable Mrs. Justice **S.ANANTHI**

H.C.P.No.1758 of 2021

P.Rajasekaran Pandian

.. Petitioner

Vs.

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

2.The District Collector / District Magistrate,
Madurai District, Madurai.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Madurai.

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records pertaining to the detention order of the respondent No.2 made in his proceedings B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V.No.16/2021 dated 22.09.2021 and quash the same and set the petitioner's son by name Vijay Sudharsan alias Komutty Vijay son of P.Rajasekaran Pandian, aged about 23 years, at liberty forthwith from the third respondent.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Prithviraj

For Respondents : Mr.S.Ravi
Addl.Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by *P.N.PRAKASH, J.*]

The petitioner is the father of the detenu viz., Vijay Sudharsan alias Komutty Vijay, aged about 23 years, son of P.Rajasekaran Pandian. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent, by his order in B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V.No.16/2021 dated



22.09.2021, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 3(2) 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 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. 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 22.09.2021. The petitioner made a representation on 11.10.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 13.10.2021. The remarks were duly received on 12.11.2021. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 30.11.2021.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 29 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 14 days were Government Holiday and hence there was an inordinate delay of 15 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 12.11.2021 and there was a delay of 13 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Electricity, Prohibition and Excise Department after the Deputy Secretary dealt with it, of which 2 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was a delay of 11 days in considering the representation.

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 15 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 11 days in considering the representation 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 B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.V.No.16/2021 dated 22.09.2021, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Vijay Sudharsan alias Komutty Vijay, aged about 23 years, son of P.Rajasekaran Pandian, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (RTI)

// True Copy //

/ /2022

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

pkn

To

1. Additional Chief Secretary
to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector / District Magistrate,
Madurai District, Madurai.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Madurai.

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



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

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

H.C.P.No.1758 of 2021
13.06.2022

RD(20.06.2022) 4P 6C