



*HCP(MD)No.1798 of 2021*

**BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT**

**DATED: 30.06.2022**

**CORAM:**

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH**

**and**

**THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE R.VIJAYAKUMAR**

**H.C.P.(MD)No.1798 of 2021**

Meena

: Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,  
Rep. by Principal Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Secretariat,  
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,  
Madurai City,  
Madurai.

3.The Superintendent,  
Central Prison,  
Madurai.

: Respondents



*HCP(MD)No.1798 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 records pertaining to the proceedings of the second respondent made in his proceedings No.63/BCDFGISSSV/2021 dated 18.11.2021 and quash the same and set the petitioner's son by name Vasudevan, S/o.Muniyandi aged about 23 years at liberty from Central Prison, Madurai / third respondent herein.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Jegadeesh Pandian

For Respondents : Mr.S.Ravi

Additional Public Prosecutor

### **O R D E R**

\*\*\*\*\*

[Order of the Court was made by **R.VIJAYAKUMAR, J.**]

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu viz., Vasudevan, aged about 23 years, son of Muniyandi. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in No.63/BCDFGISSSV/2021 dated 18.11.2021, 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.1798 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.1798 of 2021*

5.The Detention Order in question was passed on 18.11.2021.

The petitioner made a representation on 29.11.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 01.12.2021. The remarks were duly received on 21.12.2021. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 03.01.2022.

6.It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 19 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 6 days were Government Holiday and hence there was an inordinate delay of 13 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 21.12.2021 and there was a delay of 11 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 5 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was inordinate delay of 6 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



**HCP(MD)No.1798 of 2021**

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 13 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 6 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.1798 of 2021**

WEB COPY

**11.**In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in No.63/BCDFGISSSV/2021 dated 18.11.2021, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Vasudevan, aged about 23 years, son of Muniyandi, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

**[P.N.P.,J.] & [R.V.,J.]**  
**30.06.2022**

Index : Yes/No  
Internet : Yes/No  
MR



WEB COPY



**HCP(MD)No.1798 of 2021**

To

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,  
Madurai City,  
Madurai.

3.The Superintendent,  
Central Prison,  
Madurai.

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



WEB COPY



***HCP(MD)No.1798 of 2021***

**P.N.PRAKASH, J.**  
**and**  
**R.VIJAYAKUMAR, J.**

MR

**ORDER MADE IN**  
**H.C.P.(MD)No.1798 of 2021**

**30.06.2022**