



HCP(MD)No.1977 of 2021

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 04.07.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH

and

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE R.HEMALATHA

H.C.P.(MD)No.1977 of 2021

Jothilakshmi

.. Petitioner

Vs.

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tiruchirappalli City,
Tiruchirappalli District.

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli,
Tiruchirappalli District.

.. Respondents



HCP(MD)No.1977 of 2021

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the order dated 23.11.2021 made in C.No.62/Detention/C.P.O./T.C./2021 on the file of the second respondent and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's son namely, Ajith @ Clinton, son of Arockiya Susilkumar, aged about 24 years, who is now detained as a detenue at Central Prison Tiruchirappalli, Tiruchirappalli District or his corpus or body before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.J.Sankara Pandian

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by ***P.N.PRAKASH, J.***]

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu viz., Ajith @ Clinton, son of Arockiya Susilkumar, aged about 24 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C.No. 62/Detention/C.P.O./T.C./2021 dated 23.11.2021, holding him to be a



HCP(MD)No.1977 of 2021

"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



HCP(MD)No.1977 of 2021

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 Detention Order in question was passed on 23.11.2021. The petitioner made a representation on 03.01.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 04.01.2022. The remarks were duly received on 13.01.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 19.04.2022.

6. 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 was a Government Holiday and hence there was an inordinate delay of 7 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 13.01.2022 and there was a delay of 123 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Electricity, Prohibition and Excise Department after the Deputy



HCP(MD)No.1977 of 2021

Secretary dealt with it, of which 36 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was inordinate delay of 87 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.

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.1977 of 2021

10. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 7 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 87 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 C.No.62/Detention/C.P.O./T.C./2021 dated 23.11.2021, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Ajith @ Clinton, son of Arockiya Susilkumar, aged about 24 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

(P.N.P.,J.) (R.H.,J.)
04.07.2022

Index: Yes/No
Internet : Yes / No
RM



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1977 of 2021

To

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tiruchirappalli City,
Tiruchirappalli District.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli,
Tiruchirappalli District.n,
Madurai District.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1977 of 2021

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

RM

H.C.P.(MD)No.1977 of 2021

04.07.2022