



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.943 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 26.06.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.943 of 2024

K.Sivagami

... Petitioner / mother of the detenue

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Chennai.

3.The Inspector of Police,
Job Racket Wing, Team-VII, CCB,
Vepery, Chennai.

4.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai.

... Respondents

Prayer: Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the detention order passed by the 2nd



H.C.P.No.943 of 2024

Respondent on 19.02.2024 vide order No.121/BCDFGISSSV/2024 and quash the same and direct the Respondents to produce the body of the detenu Thiru.K.Sivaraj S/o. late.Kamalakannan, aged 33 years, before this Court and set him at liberty, now detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

For Petitioner : Ms.Sharada Vivek

For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner, who is the mother of the detenu K.Sivaraj S/o. late.Kamalakannan, aged about 33 years, now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd Respondent dated 19.02.2024 slapped on her son, branding him as "Goonda" 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].

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned



H.C.P.No.943 of 2024

Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

WEB COPY

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 04.03.2024. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, though the representation is dated 04.03.2024, 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 detenu on 03.04.2024. 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 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 04.03.2024, which was received by the Government on



H.C.P.No.943 of 2024

20.03.2024 and further, the Minister concerned had dealt with the file of the detenu only on 30.03.2024 and the Rejection Letter was sent to the detenu on 03.04.2024. 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. 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 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 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



H.C.P.No.943 of 2024

Government in disposing of the representation of the petitioner.

WEB COPY

9. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the 2nd Respondent, in No.121/BCDFGISSSV/2024, dated 19.02.2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., K.Sivaraj S/o. late.Kamalakannan, aged about 33 years, confined at Central Prison, 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]

26.06.2024

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Anu

To

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,



H.C.P.No.943 of 2024

Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Chennai.

3. The Inspector of Police,
Job Racket Wing, Team-VII, CCB,
Vepery, Chennai.

4. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai.

5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.943 of 2024

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

Anu

H.C.P.No.943 of 2024

26.06.2024