



HCP(MD)No.1804 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 13.07.2023

CORAM

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

H.C.P.(MD)No.1804 of 2022

Samuthiravalli

.. Petitioner /Mother of Detenu

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu

Represented by its Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home (Prohibition and Excise Department),
Secretariat,
Chennai – 9.

2.The District Collector/District Magistrate,
Collectorate,
Dindigul District.

3.The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Central Prison,
Madurai.

.. Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records in Detention Order No.91 of 2022 dated 26.09.2022 passed by the respondent No.2 on



HCP(MD)No.1804 of 2022

petitioner's son namely Thiru.Muthuraj (34/2022) S/o.Selvaraj who is detained in confined at Madurai Central Prison, Madurai District before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Rajasekar

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., Muthuraj, aged about 34 years, S/o.Selvaraj. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Detention Order No.91/2022 dated 26.09.2022 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.1804 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 26.09.2022. The petitioner made a representation, which was received on 31.10.2022.



HCP(MD)No.1804 of 2022

Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority. The remarks were duly received. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 09.11.2022.

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



HCP(MD)No.1804 of 2022

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.

10. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 4 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 7 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.



HCP(MD)No.1804 of 2022

11. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Detention Order No.91/2022 dated 26.09.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Muthuraj, S/o.Selvaraj, aged about 34 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.)
13.07.2023

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Lm/mbi

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
The State of Tamil Nadu,
Home (Prohibition and Excise Department),
Secretariat,
Chennai – 9.
- 2.The District Collector/District Magistrate,
Collectorate, Dindigul District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Central Prison, Madurai.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1804 of 2022

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

Lm/mbi

H.C.P.(MD)No.1804 of 2022

13.07.2023