



H.C.P.(MD) No.1869 of 2021

WEB COPY 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.1869 of 2021

Jesintha

... Petitioner

-VS-

1.Government of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Tirunelveli City, Tirunelveli.



H.C.P.(MD) No.1869 of 2021

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli.

... 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 passed in No.70/BCDFGISSSV/2021 dated 06.11.2021 on the file of the second respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the petitioner's son namely, Shyam @ Sam Sutharsan Vino S/o.Raja, aged 22 years, now detained at the central prison, Palayamkottai, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Maharaja

For Respondents : Mr.S.Ravi,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu viz., Shyam @ Sam Sutharsan Vino, aged about 22 years, son of Raja. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his detention order in No.70/BCDFGISSSV/2021 dated 06.11.2021, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.



H.C.P.(MD) No.1869 of 2021

WEB COPY

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.



H.C.P.(MD) No.1869 of 2021

WEB COPY

5. The Detention Order in question was passed on 06.11.2021. The petitioner made a representation on 22.11.2021. The remarks were duly received on 06.12.2021. 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 26 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 9 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was an inordinate delay of 17 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.



H.C.P.(MD) No.1869 of 2021

WEB COPY

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 17 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 in No.70/BCDFGISSSV/2021 dated 06.11.2021, passed by the



H.C.P.(MD) No.1869 of 2021

second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Shyam @ Sam Sutharsan Vino, aged about 22 years, son of Raja, 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
pkn

To:

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Tirunelveli City, Tirunelveli.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.1869 of 2021

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

pkn

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

H.C.P.(MD) No.1869 of 2021

02.08.2022