



HCP(MD)No.384 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 18.07.2023

CORAM

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

H.C.P.(MD)No.384 of 2023

Anto Desti Mono

.. Petitioner/Wife of the Detenu

Vs.

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the Collector and District Magistrate,
Tenkasi District,
Tenkasi - 627 811.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Palayamkottai Central Prison,
Tirunelveli District.

.. Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records connected with the detention order of the second respondent in M.H.S.Confdl.No.95/2022, dated 29.10.2022, quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the



HCP(MD)No.384 of 2023

body or person of the detenu, by name, Maniselvan, aged about 28 years, S/o.Raja, now, detained as "Drug Offender" at Central Prison, Palayamkottai, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Prabakaran

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Maniselvan, aged about 28 years, S/o.Raja. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in M.H.S.Confdl.No.95/2022, dated 29.10.2022, holding him to be a "Drug Offender", as contemplated under Section 2(e) of the 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.



HCP(MD)No.384 of 2023

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. Though the respondents have not filed counter affidavit, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor strongly 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 detenu and thus, there is no violation of the fundamental rights guaranteed under Articles 21 and 22 of the Constitution of India.

5. In this case, the Detention Order in question was passed on 29.10.2022. The petitioner made a representation dated 09.12.2022 and the



HCP(MD)No.384 of 2023

same was received on 12.12.2022. The remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority and the same were duly received.

Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 26.12.2022 and the same has been served on the detenu on 29.12.2022. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was delay of 8 days in considering the representation of the petitioner.

6. 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.

7. 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.



HCP(MD)No.384 of 2023

8. 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.

9. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 8 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.

10. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in M.H.S.Confdl.No.95/2022, dated 29.10.2022, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Maniselvan, aged about 28 years, S/o.Raja, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
smn2/yuva

(M.S.R., J.) (M.N.K., J.)
18.07.2023



HCP(MD)No.384 of 2023

To

WEB COPY

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the Collector and District Magistrate,
Tenkasi District,
Tenkasi - 627 811.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Palayamkottai Central Prison,
Tirunelveli District.
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.384 of 2023

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.

smn2/yuva

H.C.P.(MD)No.384 of 2023

18.07.2023