



**H.C.P.(MD) No.246 of 2024**

**WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT**

**DATED : 24.07.2024**

**CORAM:**

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA  
and  
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR**

**H.C.P.(MD) No.246 of 2024**

Puthiyaval

... Petitioner

-vs-

1.The Principal Secretary to Government,  
State of Tamil Nadu,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,  
Office of the Commissioner of Police,  
Tirunelveli City, Tirunelveli.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,  
Palayamkottai Central Prison,  
Tirunelveli District.

... Respondents

**PRAYER:** Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the entire records, connected with the detention order of the Respondent No.2 in No.3/BCDFGISSSV/2024, dated 03.01.2024 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Vignesh, son of Murugan, aged about 27 years, now detaining as "Goonda" at Palayamkottai Central Prison before



**H.C.P.(MD) No.246 of 2024**

WEB COPS this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Alagumani

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar  
Additional Public Prosecutor

**ORDER**

**[Order of the Court was made by A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.]**

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Vignesh, son of Murugan, aged about 27 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in No.3/BCDFGISSSV/2024, dated 03.01.2024 holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this habeas corpus petition.

**2.** We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents. We have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.

**3.** Though several grounds have been raised in the habeas corpus petition, learned counsel for the petitioner focused mainly on the ground that there is an unexplained delay in considering the representation of the



**H.C.P.(MD) No.246 of 2024**

petitioner, dated 13.01.2024. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, though the representation is dated 13.01.2024, the same was received by the Government on 24.01.2024 and the rejection letter was sent to the detenu on 07.02.2024. There is a delay of 5 days in Column Nos.6 to 12 of the Proforma dated 22.07.2024 in considering the petitioner's representation. The said delay of 5 days in considering the representation remains unexplained and the same vitiates the impugned detention order. In support of his contention, learned counsel for the petitioner relied on the Judgment of the Honourable Supreme Court in ***Rajammal vs. State of Tamil Nadu***, reported in ***(1999) 1 SCC 417***.

4. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor, on instructions, submitted that after satisfying with the materials placed by the Sponsoring Authority, the Detaining Authority has passed the impugned detention order and there is no illegality or infirmity in the detention order. It is also stated that even if there is any delay in disposal of the representation, it has not caused any prejudice to the rights of the detenu and hence, prayed for dismissal of the habeas corpus petition

5. As per the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner



**H.C.P.(MD) No.246 of 2024**

WEB COPY

and on perusal of the records, we find that the representation of the petitioner is dated 13.01.2024, which was received by the Government on 24.01.2024 and the rejection letter was sent to the detenu on 07.02.2024. As per the proforma submitted the by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, there is a delay of 5 days in Column Nos.6 to 12 in considering the representation of the petitioner and we find that the said delay remains unexplained.

**6.** 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. Therefore, we have to hold that the delay has vitiated further detention of the detenu.

**7.** In the above cited decision of the Honourable Supreme Court in **Rajammal's** case, 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*



WEB COPY

**H.C.P.(MD) No.246 of 2024**

*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."*

**8.** 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, in the instant case, the inordinate delay of 5 days has not been properly explained.

**9.** Further, in a recent decision in ***Ummu Sabeena vs. State of Kerala-2011 STPL (Web) 999 SC***, the Honourable 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.

**10.** In the light of the above discussion, we have no hesitation in



**H.C.P.(MD) No.246 of 2024**

quashing the order of detention on the ground of delay on the part of the Government in disposing of the representation of the petitioner.

**11.** In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in No.3/BCDFGISSSV/2024, dated 03.01.2024, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Vignesh, aged about 27 years, son of Murugan, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

**[A.D.J.C., J.]**

**[K.R.S., J.]**

**24.07.2024**

NCC : Yes / No  
Index : Yes / No  
Internet : Yes / No

am

To:

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,  
State of Tamil Nadu,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.



**H.C.P.(MD) No.246 of 2024**

WEB COPY

- 2.The Commissioner of Police,  
Office of the Commissioner of Police,  
Tirunelveli City, Tirunelveli.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,  
Palayamkottai Central Prison,  
Tirunelveli District.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,  
Madurai.

**A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.**  
**AND**  
**K.RAJASEKAR, J.**  
am



WEB COPY



**H.C.P.(MD) No.246 of 2024**

**H.C.P.(MD) No.246 of 2024**

**24.07.2024**