



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.377 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 26.03.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.377 of 2024

Selva Eashwari

...Petitioner/Mother of the Detenue

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009.

2. The Commissioner of Police/Detaining Authority,
City Police Office, Huzur Road,
Coimbatore City, Coimbatore – 18.

3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Coimbatore,
Coimbatore District.

4. The Inspector of Police,
E-1, Singanallur Police Station,
Coimbatore District.

... Respondents



H.C.P.No.377 of 2024

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the detention order in C.No.76/G/IS/2023, dated 21.11.2023 passed by the second respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's son M.Kamaraj S/o.Mariappan aged about 31 years, the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Coimbatore before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Vinoth Kumar
For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor
Assisted by Mr.Aravind.C

ORDER

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
SUNDER MOHAN, J.

The Petitioner, mother of the detenu has filed this petition challenging the order of detention passed by the 2nd respondent against her son, in C.No.76/G/IS/2023 dated 21.11.2023, branding the detenu as a "GOONDA" contemplated under the Section 3(1) of the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Goondas [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].



H.C.P.No.377 of 2024

2. Even though the learned counsel for the petitioner raised many grounds in assailing the impugned order of detention in the petition, he confined his arguments only to the ground of delay in considering the representation of the detenu, dated 27.11.2023. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, though the representation dated 27.11.2023, was received by the Government on 07.12.2023, the file has been dealt with by the Deputy Secretary only on 13.12.2023 and thereafter by the Minister concerned on 15.12.2023, the Rejection Letter prepared on 18.12.2023. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that this inordinate delay in considering the representation remains unexplained and the same vitiates the detention order. In support of his contention, the learned counsel for the petitioner relied on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Rajammal vs. State of Tamil Nadu, reported in (1999) 1 SCC 417.***

3. Heard the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.



H.C.P.No.377 of 2024

4. As per the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner and on perusal of the records, we find that, the representation of the detenu, dated 27.11.2023, which was received by the Government on 07.12.2023, was dealt with by the Minister concerned only on 15.12.2023 and the Rejection Letter was prepared on 18.12.2023. Thus, we find there is a considerable delay of seven days [after excluding the intervening Saturday and Sunday [09.12.2023, 10.12.2023, 16.12.2023, 17.12.2023], in considering the representation of the petitioner. This inordinate delay in considering the detenu's representation remain unexplained.

5. It is trite law that the representation should be very expeditiously considered and disposed of with a sense of urgency and without avoidable delay. Any unexplained delay in the disposal of the representation would be a breach of the constitutional imperative and it would render the continued detention impermissible and illegal. From the records produced, we find that no acceptable explanation has been offered for the inordinate delay. Therefore, we have to hold that the delay has vitiated further detention of the detenu.



H.C.P.No.377 of 2024

6. In the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Rajammal's case*** (*cited supra*), it has been held as follows:

"It is a constitutional obligation of the Government to consider the representation forwarded by the detenu without any delay. Though no period is prescribed by Article 22 of the Constitution for the decision to be taken on the representation, the words "as soon as may be " in clause (5) of Article 22 convey the message that the representation should be considered and disposed of at the earliest."

As per the dictum laid down by the Supreme Court in above cited ***Rajammal's case***, number of days of delay is immaterial and what is to be considered is whether the delay caused has been properly explained by the authorities concerned. But, here the inordinate delay from 08.12.2023 to 18.12.2023, has not been properly explained at all.

7. Further, in a recent decision in **Ummu Sabeena vs. State of Kerala - 2011 STPL (Web) 999 SC**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the history of personal liberty, as is well known, is a history of insistence on procedural safeguards. The expression 'as soon as may be', in Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India clearly shows the concern of the makers of



H.C.P.No.377 of 2024

the Constitution that the representation, made on behalf of the detenu, should be considered and disposed of with a sense of urgency and without any avoidable delay.

8. In the light of the above fact and law, we have no hesitation in quashing the order of detention on the ground of delay on the part of the Government in disposing of the representation of the detenu.

9. Accordingly, the habeas corpus petition is allowed and the detention order in C.No.76/G/IS/2023, dated 21.11.2023, passed by the second respondent is quashed. The detenu, viz., M.Kamaraj S/o.Mariappan aged about 31 years, is directed to be set at liberty, forthwith, unless his presence is required in connection with any other case.

**[M.S.R., J] [S.M., J]
26.03.2024**

Neutral Citation : Yes / No
dk



H.C.P.No.377 of 2024

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police/Detaining Authority,
City Police Office, Huzur Road,
Coimbatore City, Coimbatore – 18.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Coimbatore,
Coimbatore District.
4. The Inspector of Police,
E-1, Singanallur Police Station,
Coimbatore District.
5. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.377 of 2024

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
SUNDER MOHAN, J.

dk

H.C.P.No.377 of 2024

26.03.2024