



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1993 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 29.08.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

H.C.P.No.1993 of 2024

Pavithra

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep.by the Secretary,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 9.

2.The Commissioner of Police, Greater Chennai,
Office of the Commissioner of Police (Goondas Section),
Vepery, Chennai – 77.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai District.

4.The Inspector of Police,
E1, Mylapore Police Station,
Chennai District.

... Respondents

Prayer: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records relating to the Detention Order vide Memo No.475/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 09.05.2024, passed by the Second Respondent and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's husband namely Sunilkumar,



H.C.P.No.1993 of 2024

S/o.Krishnan, aged 32 years, (who is presently under going detention in the Central prison, Puzhal, Chennai), before this Court and set him at liberty and pass such further or other orders as this Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

For Petitioner : Mr. R. Rajadurai
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 No.475/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 09.05.2024, 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 reveal that, there is a delay of five days in considering the representation. The delay in considering the representation and the period during which the detainee was under detention would be construed as violation of the



H.C.P.No.1993 of 2024

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.

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:

"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."



H.C.P.No.1993 of 2024

WEB COPY

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.

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.



H.C.P.No.1993 of 2024

9. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent, in Memo No.475/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 09.05.2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Sunilkumar, S/o.Krishnan, aged 32 years, (who is presently under going detention in the Central prison, Puzhal, Chennai), is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless he is required in connection with any other case.

[S.M.S., J.]

[N.S., J.]

29.08.2024

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Case Citation: Yes/No

gd

To

- 1.The Secretary, State of Tamil Nadu,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department, Fort St.George, Chennai – 9.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police, Greater Chennai,
Office of the Commissioner of Police (Goondas Section),
Vepery, Chennai – 77.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai District.
- 4.The Inspector of Police, E1, Mylapore Police Station, Chennai District.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor, Madras High Court, Chennai - 104.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1993 of 2024

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
AND
N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

gd

H.C.P.No.1993 of 2024

29.08.2024