



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1723 of 2021

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 28.07.2022

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH
and
THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE R.HEMALATHA**

H.C.P.(MD)No.1723 of 2021

Karthik

: Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Ramanathapuram District.

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

: Respondents



HCP(MD)No.1723 of 2021

WEB COPY

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 second respondent in S.R.No.103/Goonda/2021 dated 26.10.2021 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Karthik, son of Ramanathan aged about 24 years, now detained as "Goonda" at Madurai Central Prison before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Alagumani

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar

Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

[Made by **R.HEMALATHA, J.**]

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Karthik, aged about 24 years, son of Ramanathan. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in S.R.No.103/Goonda/2021 dated 26.10.2021, 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.



HCP(MD)No.1723 of 2021

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 by filing his counter. 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.



HCP(MD)No.1723 of 2021

5.The Detention Order in question was passed on 26.10.2021.

The petitioner made a representation on 04.11.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 15.11.2021. The remarks were duly received on 22.11.2021. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 02.12.2021.

6.It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 6 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 1 day was a Government Holiday and hence there was an inordinate delay of 5 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 22.11.2021 and there was a delay of 8 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 1 day was a Government Holiday, hence, there was inordinate delay of 7 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 5 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 7 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.



HCP(MD)No.1723 of 2021

WEB COPY

11.In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in S.R.No.103/Goonda/2021 dated 26.10.2021, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Karthik, aged about 24 years, son of Ramanathan, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[P.N.P.,J.] & [R.H.,J.]
28.07.2022

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes/No
MR



HCP(MD)No.1723 of 2021

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Ramanathapuram District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Madurai Central Prison,
Madurai District.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1723 of 2021

P.N.PRAKASH, J.
and
R.HEMALATHA, J.

MR

ORDER MADE IN
H.C.P.(MD)No.1723 of 2021

28.07.2022