



HCP(MD)No.1926 of 2021

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 26.07.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH

and

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE R.HEMALATHA

H.C.P.(MD)No.1926 of 2021

Sangili Karuppan

: Petitioner

Vs.

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

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

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

: Respondents



HCP(MD)No.1926 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 Detention Order No.108/2021 dated 22.11.2021 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Sangili Karuppan son of Ganesan, aged about 28 years, detained at Central Prison, Madurai and now confined at Trichy Central Prison, Trichy, 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 detenu viz., Sangili Karuppan, aged about 28 years, son of Ganesan. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in D.O.No.108/2021 dated 22.11.2021, 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

3. Though several grounds have been raised in the Habeas

4.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor strongly opposed the



HCP(MD)No.1926 of 2021

5.The Detention Order in question was passed on 22.11.2021.

The petitioner made a representation on 06.12.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 13.12.2021. The remarks were duly received on 19.01.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 16.06.2022.

6.It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 36 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 12 days were Government Holiday and hence there was an inordinate delay of 24 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 19.01.2022 and there was a delay of 146 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 29 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was inordinate delay of 117 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.1926 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 24 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 117 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.1926 of 2021

WEB COPY

11.In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Detention Order No.108/2021 dated 22.11.2021, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Sangili Karuppan, aged about 28 years, son of Ganesan, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[P.N.P.J.] & [R.H.,J.]
26.07.2022

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes/No
MR



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1926 of 2021

To

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



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1926 of 2021

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

MR

ORDER MADE IN
H.C.P.(MD)No.1926 of 2021

26.07.2022