



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.976 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 24.07.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.976 of 2024

Sudha .. Petitioner/
Friend of detenue

Versus

1. The State Represented by
The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police, Greater Chennai
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
(Goondas Section), Vepery,
Chennai - 600 007.
3. The Superintendent, Central Prison,
Puzhal,
Chennai - 600 066.
4. The Inspector of Police,
Job Racket Investigation Wing, Team VIII,
Central Crime Branch - I,
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007. .. Respondents



H.C.P.No.976 of 2024

Prayer : Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the 2nd respondent in detention order No.302/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 04.04.2024 against the detainee S.Sundhara Bharathy, male, aged about 61, son of Sadagopal confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai and set aside the same, consequently, direct the respondents to produce the body of the detainee before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Sagayanathan

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner, who is the friend of the detainee Sundara Bharathy, S/o.Sadagopal, aged about 61 years, now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 04.04.2024 slapped on her friend, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand



H.C.P.No.976 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 undated representation of the petitioner. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, though the representation is dated 26.04.2024, the same has been received by the Government only on 29.04.2024; the file has been dealt with by the Deputy Secretary on 03.05.2024 and the Minister concerned dealt with the file only on 08.05.2024 and the Rejection Letter was prepared on 08.05.2024 and sent to the detainee on 09.05.2024. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that the delay of 3 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.976 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 was received by the Government on 29.04.2024 and further, the Minister concerned had dealt with the file of the detainee only on 08.05.2024 and the Rejection Letter was sent to the detainee on 09.05.2024 Thus, we find there is a considerable delay of 3 days in considering the representation of the petitioner. This delay of 3 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 3 days.



H.C.P.No.976 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 3 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.976 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 No.302/BCDFGISSSV/2024, dated 04.04.2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detainee viz., Sundara Bharathy, S/o.Sadagopal, aged about 61 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]



H.C.P.No.976 of 2024

24.07.2024

WEB COPY

Index : yes/no

Speaking order/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation : yes/no

grs

Note :- Registry shall forthwith return the booklet containing the materials, on which, the Detaining Authority has placed reliance, to the petitioner/counsel for the petitioner with due acknowledgment.



H.C.P.No.976 of 2024

To

WEB COPY

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police, Greater Chennai
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
(Goondas Section), Vepery,
Chennai - 600 007.
3. The Superintendent, Central Prison,
Puzhal,
Chennai - 600 066.
4. The Inspector of Police,
Job Racket Investigation Wing, Team VIII,
Central Crime Branch - I,
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.976 of 2024

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

grs

H.C.P.No.976 of 2024

24.07.2024