



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.620 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 04.07.2024

CORAM :

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN**

H.C.P.No.620 of 2024

Pavithra

.. Petitioner/
Wife of the detenuue

Versus

1. The State of Tamilnadu,
Represented by Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Erode District,
Erode.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Erode District,
Erode.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Coimbatore.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Chithode Police Station,
Erode.

.. Respondents



H.C.P.No.620 of 2024

WEB COPY

Prayer : Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records relating to the detention order, dated 03.03.2024 passed by the second respondent in his proceedings No.Cr.M.P.No.06/Goonda/2024 C1 and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce petitioner's husband namely Dinesh @ Dinesh Kumar, son of Soundarapandiyan aged about 32 years, who is presently under going detention in the Central Prison, Coimbatore, as Goonda before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.S.Saravanan

For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner, who is the wife of the detenue Dinesh alias Dinesh Kumar, S/o.Soundarapandiyan, aged about 32 years, now confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 03.03.2024 slapped on her husband, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders,



H.C.P.No.620 of 2024

WEB COPY

Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Sexual Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

3. Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner focused mainly on the ground that there is an unexplained delay in considering the representation of the petitioner, dated 18.03.2024. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, though the representation is dated 18.03.2024, the same has been received by the Government only on 20.03.2024; the file has been dealt with by the Deputy Secretary on 22.03.2024 and the Minister concerned dealt with the file only on 30.03.2024 and the Rejection Letter was prepared on 01.04.2024 and sent to the detainee on 02.04.2024. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that the delay of 4 days 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



H.C.P.No.620 of 2024

of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Rajammal Vs. State of Tamil Nadu*,
WEB COPY
reported in (1999) 1 SCC 417.

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 petitioner is dated 18.03.2024, which was received by the Government on 20.03.2024 and further, the Minister concerned had dealt with the file of the detainee only on 30.03.2024 and the Rejection Letter was sent to the detainee on 02.04.2024. Thus, we find there is a considerable delay of 4 days in considering the representation of the petitioner. This delay of 4 days in considering the petitioner's representation remains 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 delay of 4 days.



H.C.P.No.620 of 2024

Therefore, we have to hold that the delay has vitiated further detention of the detenu.

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 of 4 days 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



H.C.P.No.620 of 2024

WEB COPY

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

8. In the light of the above discussion, 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 petitioner.

9. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent, in Cr.M.P.No.06/Goonda/2024 C1, dated 03.03.2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detainee viz., Dinesh alias Dinesh Kumar, S/o.Soundarapandiyan, aged about 32 years, confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless he is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R., J]

[S.M., J]



H.C.P.No.620 of 2024

04.07.2024

WEB COPY

Index : yes/no

Speaking order/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation : yes/no

grs



H.C.P.No.620 of 2024

To

WEB COPY

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Erode District,
Erode.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Erode District,
Erode.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Coimbatore.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Chithode Police Station,
Erode.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.620 of 2024

**M.S.RAMESH, J.
AND
SUNDER MOHAN, J.**

grs

H.C.P.No.620 of 2024

04.07.2024