



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1839 of 2022

THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.03.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **M.SUNDAR**  
and  
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **M.NIRMAL KUMAR**

**H.C.P.No.1839 of 2022**

Babu

.. Petitioner

Vs

- 1.State of Tamil Nadu  
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,  
Kallakurichi District, Kallakurichi.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,  
O/o.Superintendent of Police,  
Kallakurichi, Kallakurichi District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison,  
Cuddalore, Cuddalore District.
- 5.State rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
PEW Kallakurichi Police Station,  
Kallakurichi District.

.. Respondents

Page Nos.1/8



H.C.P.No.1839 of 2022

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus to call for the entire records relating to the petitioner's father detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order dated 01.09.2022 on the file of second respondent herein and made in proceedings D.O.No.C2/47/2022 and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's father namely Boopathi son of Tholan, aged about 32 years before this Court and set the petitioner's father at liberty from detention, now the petitioner's father detained in Central Prison, Cuddalore.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Paarthiban  
for Mr.R.Sasikumar

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj  
Additional Public Prosecutor  
Assisted by Mr.M.Sylvester John

### ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by **M.SUNDAR, J.,**]

Captioned 'Habeas Corpus Petition' ['HCP' for the sake of brevity] has been filed by son of detenu assailing a 'preventive detention order dated 01.09.2022 bearing reference D.O.No.C2/47/2022' [hereinafter 'impugned detention order' for the sake of convenience and brevity]. To be noted, fifth respondent is the sponsoring authority and second respondent is the



H.C.P.No.1839 of 2022

detaining authority as impugned detention order has been made by second respondent.

2.Impugned detention order has been made under 'The Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber law offenders, Drug-offenders, Forest-offenders, Goondas, Immoral traffic offenders, Sand-offenders, Sexual-offenders, Slum-grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamil Nadu Act No.14 of 1982)' [hereinafter 'Act 14 of 1982' for the sake of convenience and clarity] on the premise that the detenu is a 'Bootlegger' within the meaning of Section 2(b) of Act 14 of 1982.

3.There is one adverse case. The ground case which is the sole substratum of the impugned detention order is Crime No.237 of 2022 on the file of Kallakurichi Prohibition Enforcement Wing for alleged offences under Sections 4(1)(aaa), 4(1-A) of Tamil Nadu Prohibition Act, 1937. Owing to the nature of the challenge to the impugned detention order, it is not necessary to delve into the factual matrix or be detained further by facts.



H.C.P.No.1839 of 2022

4.Mr.V.Paarthiban, learned counsel representing Mr.R.Sasikumar, learned counsel on record for petitioner and Mr.R.Muniyapparaj, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor assisted by Mr.M.Sylvester John, learned counsel for all respondents are before us.

5.Though several grounds have been urged in the support affidavit, learned counsel for petitioner at the hearing exhorted one point in his campaign against the impugned detention order and that one point turns on delay in considering a representation sent qua impugned detention order.

6.Responding to the aforementioned submission, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor submitted to the contrary and placed before us a list of dates and the details of the same are as follows:

|                                                 |           |                   |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| <i>'Representation dated</i>                    | <i>..</i> | <i>12.09.2022</i> |
| <i>Representation received dated</i>            | <i>..</i> | <i>15.09.2022</i> |
| <i>File submitted on dated</i>                  | <i>..</i> | <i>30.09.2022</i> |
| <i>Under Secretary dealt with on</i>            | <i>..</i> | <i>30.09.2022</i> |
| <i>Deputy Secretary dealt with on</i>           | <i>..</i> | <i>30.09.2022</i> |
| <i>Minister dealt with and file received on</i> | <i>..</i> | <i>10.10.2022</i> |



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1839 of 2022

*Rejected letter prepared on .. 10.10.2022*

*Rejection letter sent to the detenu on .. 11.10.2022*

**Govt. Holidays falls on:**

*18.09.2022, 24.09.2022, 25.09.2022, 01.10.2022, 02.10.2022,  
04.10.2022, 05.10.2022, 08.10.2022, 09.10.2022.*

| S.No.               | Representation   | Column 6 to 7 | Column 9 to 10 |
|---------------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|
| 1.                  | No. of days      | 15            | 9              |
| 2.                  | No. of holidays  | 3             | 6              |
|                     | Total delay days | 12            | 3              |
| Total 15 days delay |                  |               |                |

7.We find that even if the intervening 9 public/Government holidays 18.09.2022, 24.09.2022, 25.09.2022, 01.10.2022, 02.10.2022, 04.10.2022, 05.10.2022, 08.10.2022 and 09.10.2022 are excluded, there is a delay of 15 days in considering the representation. We make it clear that the delay in considering the representation point in challenges to preventive detention orders cannot be decided quantitatively. It has to be decided qualitatively based on the facts, circumstances and the trajectory the representation has taken, in other words, it has to be decided on case to case basis. In the case on hand, we adopt such an approach and we find that 15 days delay vitiates the impugned detention order. We also hasten to make it clear that there can



H.C.P.No.1839 of 2022

be no straight jacket formula in terms of number of days as regards this point is concerned and therefore, this order will not serve as precedent in all and every case.

8.Ergo, the sequitur is, captioned HCP is allowed. Impugned detention order dated 01.09.2022 bearing reference D.O.No.C2/47/2022 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Boopathi, aged 32 years, son of Thiru.Tholan, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, if not required in connection with any other case / cases. There shall be no order as to costs.

(M.S.,J.) (M.N.K.,J.)  
27.03.2023

Index : Yes / No  
Neutral Citation : Yes / No  
Speaking Order/Non-Speaking Order  
cse

**P.S: Registry to forthwith communicate this order to Jail authorities in Central Prison, Cuddalore.**



*H.C.P.No.1839 of 2022*

WEB COPY To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,  
Kallakurichi District, Kallakurichi.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,  
O/o.Superintendent of Police,  
Kallakurichi, Kallakurichi District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison,  
Cuddalore, Cuddalore District.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,  
PEW Kallakurichi Police Station,  
Kallakurichi District.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,  
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



*H.C.P.No.1839 of 2022*

**M.SUNDAR, J.,  
and  
M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.,**

*cse*

H.C.P.No.1839 of 2022

27.03.2023

Page Nos.8/8