



HCP(MD)No.1792 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 18.11.2022

CORAM

**THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH
AND
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.ANAND VENKATESH**

H.C.P.(MD)No.1792 of 2022

Mallika

.. Petitioner / mother of the
detenu

Vs

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

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

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

.. Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to
issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records relating to the
detention order passed by the second Respondent in Detention Order No.
25/2022 dated 01.04.2022 and to quash the same and direct the Respondents



HCP(MD)No.1792 of 2022

to produce the body or person of the detenu by name, Yogesh, son of Balamurugan, aged about 21 years, now confined at Central Prison, Madurai before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Jainul Abudheen

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar

Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

N. ANAND VENKATESH,J.

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu viz., Yogesh, son of Balamurugan, aged about 21 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Detention Order No.25/2022 dated 01.04.2022 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. 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 learned Additional Public Prosecutor, on instructions, submitted that the detenu was arrested on 07.03.2022 and the investigation was completed and final report was filed on 17.05.2022 on time. It was



HCP(MD)No.1792 of 2022

further submitted that the case is now pending in Spl.S.C.No.29/2022 before the PCR Court, Dindigul and the case stands posted for hearing on 08.12.2022.

6. The Detention Order in question was passed on 01.04.2022. The petitioner made a representation dated 01.06.2022 and the representation was received on 06.06.2022. Thereafter, the file was submitted on 16.06.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 17.06.2022.

7. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 9 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 2 days were Government holidays and hence, there was an inordinate delay of 7 days in submitting the remarks.

8. 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



HCP(MD)No.1792 of 2022

alleged activities undertaken by the detenu.

WEB COPY

9. 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.

10. 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.

11. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 7 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority. The impugned detention order is, therefore, liable to be quashed.

12. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Detention Order No.25/2022 dated 01.04.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Yogesh, son of



HCP(MD)No.1792 of 2022

Balamurugan, aged about 21 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R.,J.] & [N.A.V.,J.]
18.11.2022

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes
PJJ

To

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



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1792 of 2022



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1792 of 2022

M.S.RAMESH,J.

and

N. ANAND VENKATESH,J.

PJL

H.C.P.(MD)No.1792 of 2022

18.11.2022