



H.C.P.No.1505 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.1505 of 2024

Suba .. Petitioner/
Wife of detenue

Versus

1. State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by the Secretary,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Office of District Collectorate,
Namakkal,
Namakkal District.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Selam District,
Selam.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Selam Central Prison,
Selam.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Pallipalayam Police Station,
Pallipalayam Circle,



H.C.P.No.1505 of 2024

WEB COPY

Namakkal District.

.. Respondents

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 relating to the detention order C.M.P.No.09/Goonda/2024/(M1), dated 04.04.2024 passed by the 2nd respondent under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and quash the same and direct the respondent to produce the detainee Sujith, son of Matheswaran, aged about 25 years, now confined in Central Prison, Salem, before this Court and set the detainee Sujith, son of Matheswaran, aged about 25 years at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Saranraj

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 detainee Sujith, S/o.Matheswaran, aged about 25 years, now confined at Central Prison, Salem, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 04.04.2024 slapped on her husband, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest



H.C.P.No.1505 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 undated representation of the petitioner. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, though the representation is dated 20.05.2024, the same has been received by the Government only on 21.05.2024; the file has been dealt with by the Deputy Secretary on 29.05.2024 and the Minister concerned dealt with the file only on 31.05.2024 and the Rejection Letter was prepared on 03.06.2024 and sent to the detainee on 04.06.2024. 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



H.C.P.No.1505 of 2024

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

WEB COPY

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 21.05.2024 and further, the Minister concerned had dealt with the file of the detainee only on 31.05.2024 and the Rejection Letter was sent to the detainee on 04.06.2024. 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.



H.C.P.No.1505 of 2024

WEB COPY

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



H.C.P.No.1505 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 C.M.P.No.09/Goonda/2024/(M1), dated 04.04.2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detainee viz., Sujith, S/o.Matheswaran, aged about 25 years, confined at Central Prison, Salem, 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.1505 of 2024

24.07.2024

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.

To

1. The Secretary,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Office of District Collectorate,
Namakkal,
Namakkal District.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Salem District,
Salem.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Salem Central Prison,
Salem.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Pallipalayam Police Station,
Pallipalayam Circle,
Namakkal District.



H.C.P.No.1505 of 2024

5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1505 of 2024

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

grs

H.C.P.No.1505 of 2024

24.07.2024