



WEB COPY

HCP.No.1295 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED :16.08.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

H.C.P.No.1295 of 2024

Alumelu

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1 The Secretary To Government,
Home Prohibition And Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai 9
- 2 District Collector and District Magistrate of
Vellore District, Vellore.
- 3 The Superintendent of Police,
Vellore District, Vellore.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Vellore.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Bagayam Police Station,
Vellore.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a



HCP.No.1295 of 2024

Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the second respondent dated 23.05.2024 in C3/D.O.No.24/2024 against the petitioner son Dhamodaren, male aged 27 years S/o.Thirunavukkarasu, who is confined at Central Prison, Vellore and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenue before the Court and set him at Liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Balaji

For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by *S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.*)

The order of detention passed by the 2nd respondent in proceedings Memo C3/D.O.No.24/2024 dated 23.05.2024, is sought to be quashed in the present Habeas Corpus Petition.

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

3. The order of detention sought to be assailed and the fact as narrated would



HCP.No.1295 of 2024

reveal that, there is a delay of three days in considering the representation. The delay in considering the representation and the period during which the detenu was under detention would be construed as violation of the Constitutional mandatory under Article 22 of Constitution of India and thus, the ground of delay in considering the representation became fatal in the case of preventive detention. Another ground on which the detention order is assailed is that the detenu was arrested on 22.04.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 23.05.2024.

4. 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.

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



HCP.No.1295 of 2024

WEB COPY

"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."

6.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 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.



HCP.No.1295 of 2024

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 Memo C3/D.O.No.24/2024 dated 23.05.2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Dhamodaren, male aged 27 years S/o.Thirunavukkarasu, who is confined at Central Prison, Vellore, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless he is required in connection with any other case.

[S.M.S., J.]

[V.S.G., J.]

16.08.2024

Index : Yes/No
Speaking Order : Yes/No
Neutral Citation : Yes/No
gd



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1295 of 2024

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
AND
V.SIVAGNANAM, J.

gd

To

- 1 The Secretary To Government,
Home Prohibition And Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai 9
- 2 District Collector and District Magistrate of
Vellore District, Vellore.
- 3 The Superintendent of Police,
Vellore District, Vellore.
- 4 The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Vellore.
- 5 The Inspector of Police,
Bagayam Police Station,
Vellore.
- 6 The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court

H.C.P.No.1295 of 2024

16.08.2024