



HCP(MD)No.69 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 20.07.2023

CORAM

**THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH
AND
THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR**

H.C.P.(MD)No.69 of 2023

Shanmugavalli

... Petitioner / Mother of the Detenu

Vs.

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 9.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thanjavur District, Thanjavur.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
Kallaperambur Police Station,
Thanjavur District.

.. Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to
issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the



HCP(MD)No.69 of 2023

detention order passed by the 2nd respondent in P.D.No.158/2022, dated 19.11.2022 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or detenu, namely, Pangajkumar, S/o.Pandiyan, aged about 23 years now detained at Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Karunanithi

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by *M.S.RAMESH,J.*)

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu viz., Pangajkumar, S/o.Pandiyan, aged about 23 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in P.D.No.158/2022, dated 19.11.2022, 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.69 of 2023

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



5. The Detention Order in question was passed on 19.11.2022. The petitioner made a representation dated 28.11.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority and the remarks were duly received. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 19.12.2022.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 7 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which, 2 days were Government Holidays and hence, there was inordinate delay of 5 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received and there was a delay of 9 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, 4 days



HCP(MD)No.69 of 2023

were Government Holidays and hence, there was inordinate delay of 5 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.69 of 2023

WEB COPY

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 5 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 P.D.No.158/2022, dated 19.11.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Pangajkumar, S/o.Pandiyan, aged about 23 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

(M.S.R.,J.) & (M.N.K.,J.)
20.07.2023

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No

Yuva / RR

Page 6 of 8



HCP(MD)No.69 of 2023

To

WEB COPY

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 9.
- 2.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public Law and Order,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.
- 3.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thanjavur District, Thanjavur.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Kallaperambur Police Station,
Thanjavur District.
- 6.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.69 of 2023

**M.S.RAMESH, J.
AND
M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.**

Yuva / RR

H.C.P.(MD)No.69 of 2023

20.07.2023