



HCP(MD)No.1965 of 2021

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 12.07.2022

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH
and
THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE R.HEMALATHA**

H.C.P.(MD)No.1965 of 2021

M.Muniammal

: Petitioner

Vs.

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

2.The District Collector / District Magistrate,
Virudhunagar District,
Virudhunagar.

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

: Respondents



HCP(MD)No.1965 of 2021

WEB COPY

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records relating to the detention order passed by the second respondent in Cr.M.P.No. 16/2021 (GOONDA) dated 13.11.2021 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu Mani @ Manikandan, Son of Jeyaraj, Male aged 38 years, who is detained at Central Prison, Madurai before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.I.Suthakaran

For Respondents : Mr.S.Ravi

Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

[Order of the Court was made by **R.HEMALATHA, J.**]

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Mani @ Manikandan, aged about 38 years, son of Jeyaraj. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Cr.M.P. No.16/2021 dated 13.11.2021, 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.



HCP(MD)No.1965 of 2021

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.




HCP(MD)No.1965 of 2021

5.The Detention Order in question was passed on 13.11.2021.

The petitioner made a representation on 01.12.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 03.12.2021. The remarks were duly received on 13.12.2021. 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 9 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 4 days were Government Holiday and hence there was an inordinate delay of 5 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 13.12.2021 and there was a delay of 20 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 7 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was inordinate delay of 13 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



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 5 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 13 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.1965 of 2021

WEB COPY

11.In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Cr.M.P.No.16/2021 dated 13.11.2021, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Mani @ Manikandan, aged about 38 years, son of Jeyaraj, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[P.N.P.J.] & [R.H.,J.]
12.07.2022

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes/No
MR



HCP(MD)No.1965 of 2021

WEB COPY

To

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



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1965 of 2021

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

MR

ORDER MADE IN
H.C.P.(MD)No.1965 of 2021

12.07.2022