



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.898 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 03.06.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.898 of 2024

R.Anu

... Petitioner / daughter of the detenue
Vs.

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Chennai City,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai.

3.The Superintendent,
Special Prison for Women,
Puzhal, Chennai.

4.The Inspector of Police,
V-4, Rajamangalam Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondents

Prayer: Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records pertaining to the order of detention passed by the



H.C.P.No.898 of 2024

second respondent herein and made in BCDFGISSSV No.664/2023, and to set aside the same and direct the third respondent to produce the detenu, the petitioner's mother, Latha W/o.Murugesan@Chinnapayan, confined in Special Prison for Women, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and thereby set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Anantha Padmanabhan

For Respondents : Mr.E. Raj Thilak,
Additional Public Prosecutor
assisted by Mr.C. Aravind

ORDER

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

The petitioner, who is the daughter of the detenu, Latha W/o.Murugesan @ Chinnapayan, confined at Special Prison for Women, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 13.12.2023 slapped on her mother, branding her as "Bootlegger" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].



H.C.P.No.898 of 2024

WEB COPY 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 17.03.2024. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, though the representation is dated 17.03.2024, the same has been received by the Government only on 19.03.2024; the file has been dealt with by the Deputy Secretary on 22.03.2024 and the Minister concerned dealt with the file only on 02.04.2024 and the Rejection Letter was prepared on 03.04.2024 and sent to the detenu on 04.04.2024. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that the delay of 5 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 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Rajammal Vs. State of Tamil Nadu, 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 17.03.2024, which was received by the Government on 19.03.2024 and further, the Minister concerned had dealt with the file of the detenu only on 02.04.2024 and the Rejection Letter was sent to the detenu on 04.04.2024. Thus, we find there is a considerable delay of 5 days in considering the representation of the petitioner. This delay of 5 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 5 days. 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 5 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 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 detenu, should be considered and disposed of with a sense of urgency



H.C.P.No.898 of 2024

and without any avoidable delay.

WEB COPY

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 BCDFGISSSV No.664/2023, dated 13.12.2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Latha W/o.Murugesan @ Chinnapayan, confined at Special Prison for Women, Puzhal, Chennai, 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]

03.06.2024

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Anu

To

1.The Additional Chief Secretary,
Government of Tamil Nadu,



H.C.P.No.898 of 2024

Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.

WEB COPY

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Chennai City,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai.

3.The Superintendent,
Special Prison for Women,
Puzhal, Chennai.

4.The Inspector of Police,
V-4, Rajamangalam Police Station,
Chennai.

5.The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.

6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.898 of 2024

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

Anu

H.C.P.No.898 of 2024

03.06.2024