



H.C.P.No.1092 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 03.01.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH
AND
THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH

H.C.P.No.1092 of 2022

C.Raja

Vs.

Petitioner

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
2. District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tirupathur District, Tirupathur 635 601
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Tirupathur District, Tirupathur.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Special Prison for Women, Vellore – 2
5. The Inspector of Police,
Natrampalli Police Station,
Tirupathur District.

Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS in Connection with the order of detention passed



H.C.P.No.1092 of 2022

by the second respondent dated 03.06.2022 in C3/D.O.No.35/2022 against the petitioner Wife Suguna, Female aged 42 years W/o.Raja, who is confined at Special Prison for Women, Vellore and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenue before the Court and set her at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Balaji
For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Made by P.N.PRAKASH, J.]

The petitioner is the daughter of the detenue *viz.*, Suguna, Female aged 42 years W/o.Raja. The detenue has been detained by the 2nd respondent by his order dated 03.06.2022 in C3/D.O.No.35/2022, holding her to be a "Bootlegger", as contemplated under Section 2(b) 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.



H.C.P.No.1092 of 2022

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 opposed the Habeas Corpus Petition. 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 detainee 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 03.05.2022. The petitioner made a representation dated 21.06.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation



H.C.P.No.1092 of 2022

on 21.06.2022.

WEB COPY

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 49 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister concerned, after the Deputy Secretary dealt with it, of which 14 days were Government holidays. Hence, there was inordinate delay of 35 days in considering the representation.

7. In **Rekha Vs. State of Tamil Nadu [2011 (5) SCC 244]**, the Hon'ble 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.



H.C.P.No.1092 of 2022

9. In **Tara Chand Vs. State of Rajasthan and others**, reported in [1980 (2) SCC 321], the Hon'ble 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 35 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister concerned. The impugned detention order is, therefore, liable to be quashed.

In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in C3/D.O.No.35/2022 dated 03.06.2022, passed by the 2nd respondent is set aside. The detainee *viz.*, Suguna, Female aged 42 years W/o.Raja, is directed to be released forthwith, unless her detention is required in connection with any other case.

[P.N.P., J.] [N.A.V., J.]
03.01.2023

rka



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1092 of 2022

P.N.PRAKASH, J.
AND
N. ANAND VENKATESH, J.

rka

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
2. District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tirupathur District, Tirupathur 635 601
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Tirupathur District, Tirupathur.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Special Prison for Women, Vellore – 2
5. The Inspector of Police,
Natrampalli Police Station,
Tirupathur District.
- 6 The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras

H.C.P.No.1092 of 2022

03.01.2023