



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2116 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 13.09.2024

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
AND
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

H.C.P.No.2116 of 2024

R.Mythili .. Petitioner

v.

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009
2. The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai Police
Office of the Commissioner of Police
(Goonda Section), Vepery
Chennai 600 007
3. The Superintendent
Central Prison, Puzhal
Chennai 600 066
4. The Inspector of Police
Central Crime Branch-II
Beta-9, Forgery Investigation Wing
Egmore, Chennai 600 008

.. Respondents



H.C.P.No.2116 of 2024

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records pertaining to the order of detention passed by the second respondent in Order No:750/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 03.07.2024 set aside the same, direct to produce the detenu Thiru.Vidya Sekar, Male, aged 38, S/o Singaravelu and presently detained in Central Prison at Puzhal before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner :: Mr.R.Ganesh Kumar

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 No.750/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 03.07.2024 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 six days in considering the



H.C.P.No.2116 of 2024

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 mandate 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 v. State of Tamil Nadu and another, (1999) 1 SCC 417***, it has been held as follows:



H.C.P.No.2116 of 2024

"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)



H.C.P.No.2116 of 2024

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.

9. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent in No.750/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 03.07.2024, is hereby set aside and the habeas corpus petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Thiru.Vidya Sekar S/o Singaravelu, aged 38 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.

Index : yes
Neutral citation : yes/no

(S.M.S.,J.) (V.S.G.,J.)
13.09.2024



H.C.P.No.2116 of 2024

WEB COPY To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009
2. The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai Police
Office of the Commissioner of Police
(Goonda Section), Vepery
Chennai 600 007
3. The Superintendent
Central Prison, Puzhal
Chennai 600 066
4. The Inspector of Police
Central Crime Branch-II
Beta-9, Forgery Investigation Wing
Egmore, Chennai 600 008
5. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2116 of 2024

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM,J.

AND

V.SIVAGNANAM,J.

SS

H.C.P.No.2116 of 2024

13.09.2024