



HCP(MD)No.1867 of 2021

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 02.08.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH

and

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE R.HEMALATHA

H.C.P.(MD)No.1867 of 2021

Selin Mangalam

: Petitioner

Vs.

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

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

3.The Inspector of Police,
Lalapet Police Station,
Karur.
(Crime No.399 of 2021).



HCP(MD)No.1867 of 2021

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.

: Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, directing the respondents to produce the person or body of detenu namely 'Rajkumar @ Kumuli Rajkumar' aged about 41/2021 years son of Perumal before this Court who is now detained in the Central Prison, Trichy in pursuant to the detention order passed by the second respondent in Cr.M.P.No. 20/2021 dated 02.11.2021 and to call for the records and quash the same and release the detenu at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Mohideen Basha

For Respondents : Mr.S.Ravi

Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

[Made by **P.N.PRAKASH, J.**]

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Rajkumar @ Kumuli Rajkumar, aged about 41 years, son of Perumal. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Cr.M.P.No.20/2021



HCP(MD)No.1867 of 2021

dated 02.11.2021, 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.

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.



HCP(MD)No.1867 of 2021

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 02.11.2021. The petitioner made a representation on 19.11.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 24.11.2021. The remarks were duly received on 02.12.2021. 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 7 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 6 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 02.12.2021 and there was a delay of 31 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 11 days were



HCP(MD)No.1867 of 2021

Government Holidays, hence, there was inordinate delay of 20 days in considering the representation.

WEB COPY

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.



HCP(MD)No.1867 of 2021

WEB COPY

10.In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 6 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 20 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 Cr.M.P.No.20/2021 dated 02.11.2021, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Rajkumar @ Kumuli Rajkumar, aged about 41 years, son of Perumal, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[P.N.P.J.] & [R.H.J.]
02.08.2022

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes/No
MR



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1867 of 2021

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
For St. George,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Karur District,
Karur.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
Lalapet Police Station,
Karur.
(Crime No.399 of 2021).
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.
- 5.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1867 of 2021

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

MR

ORDER MADE IN
H.C.P.(MD)No.1867 of 2021

02.08.2022