



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT  
DATED: 23.06.2022  
CORAM

The Honourable Mr. Justice **P.N.PRAKASH**  
and  
The Honourable Mrs. Justice **R.HEMALATHA**

H.C.P. (MD)No.1999 of 2021

Raja .. Petitioner /Father of the detenu  
Vs.

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government  
State of Tamilnadu  
Home, Prohibition and Excise department  
Fort St. George,  
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector  
Office of the District collector and District Magistrate  
Karur District.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,  
Trichy Central Prison,  
Trichy District. .. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the entire records connected with the detention order of the respondent No.2 in Cr.M.P.No.21/2021 dated 11.11.2021 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Rabert, son of Raja, aged about 22 years, now detained as 'GOONDA' at Trichy Central Prison before this court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Alagumani  
For Respondents : Mr.S.Ravi  
Additional Public Prosecutor

**ORDER**

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

The petitioner is the detenu viz., Rabert, S/o.Raja, aged about 22 years, The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Cr.M.P.No.21/2021 dated 11.11.2021 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 petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents. We have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.

WEB COPY

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 Detention Order in question was passed on 11.11.2021. The petitioner made a representation on 19.11.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority and duly received on 02.12.2021. 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 the remarks were received on 02.12.2021 and there was a delay of 31 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 11 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was inordinate delay of 20 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.

10. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 20 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 Cr.M.P.No.21/2021 dated 11.11.2021 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Rabert, S/o.Raja, aged about 22 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-III)

// True Copy //

/07/2022

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

**RR**

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government  
State of Tamilnadu  
Home, Prohibition and Excise department  
Fort St. George, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector  
Office of the District collector and District Magistrate  
Karur District.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,  
Trichy Central Prison, Trichy District.
- 4.The Joint Secretary to Government,  
Public (Law & Order), Fort saint George, Chennai-600 009.
5. The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

H.C.P. (MD)No.1999 of 2021  
23.06.2022

RD(06.07.2022) 3P 6C