



HCP(MD)No.1638 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 05.07.2023

CORAM

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

H.C.P.(MD)No.1638 of 2022

V.Govindharaj

.. Petitioner /father
of the detenu

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu

rep. by the Additional Chief Secretary to Government
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tirunelveli City
Tirunelveli.

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

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records connected with the detention order passed in No.71/BCDFGISSSV/2022 dated 05.08.2022 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu or body of the detenu namely the petitioner's son ie.,



HCP(MD)No.1638 of 2022

Navaneethakrishnan, aged about 30 years, S/o.Govindaraj, now detained at the Central Prison, Palayamkottai before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Pragalathan

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the father of the detenu viz., Navaneethakrishnan, aged about 30 years, S/o.Govindharaj. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in detention order No. 71/BCDFGISSSV/2022 dated 05.08.2022 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.

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.1638 of 2022

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 05.08.2022. The petitioner made a representation dated 26.09.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority and the



HCP(MD)No.1638 of 2022

remarks were duly received. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 20.10.2022.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 17 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 8 days were Government holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 9 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 5 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, 3 days were a Government Holiday and hence, there was inordinate delay of 2 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.



HCP(MD)No.1638 of 2022

WEB COURT

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 9 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 2 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.

6. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in No.71/BCDFGISSSV/2022 dated 05.08.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Navaneethakrishnan



HCP(MD)No.1638 of 2022

S/o.Govindharaj, aged about 30 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.)

05.07.2023

NCC : Yes/No

Internet : Yes

RR

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tirunelveli City
Tirunelveli.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Palayamkottai
Tirunelveli.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1638 of 2022

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

RR

H.C.P.(MD)No.1638 of 2022

05.07.2023