



H.C.P.(MD) No.669 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.669 of 2024

Amirthavalli

... Petitioner

-VS-

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary of Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Thoothukudi District,
Thoothukudi.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai.

... 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, leading to the detention of the petitioner's son namely Bharath Chakkaravarthi, S/o.Lenin Murugan, aged about 28 years vide detention order dated 07.12.2023 made in H.S(M) Confdl.No.173/2023 passed by the second respondent and quash the same



H.C.P.(MD) No.669 of 2024

and consequently direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu now detained at Central Person, Palayamkottai before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Suyanbulingabharathi
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 mother of the detenu viz., Bharath Chakkaravarthi, son of Lenin Murugan, aged about 27 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in H.S(M)Confdl.No. 173/2023, dated 07.12.2023 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



H.C.P.(MD) No.669 of 2024

petition, learned counsel for the petitioner focused mainly on the ground that there is an unexplained delay in considering the representation of the petitioner, dated 01.04.2024. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, though the representation is dated 01.04.2024, the same was received by the Government on 03.04.2024 and the rejection letter was sent to the detenu on 20.04.2024. There is a delay of 5 days in Column Nos.6 to 12 of the Proforma dated 23.07.2024 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



WEB COPY

H.C.P.(MD) No.669 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."

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



H.C.P.(MD) No.669 of 2024

WEB COPY delay.

10. 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.

11. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in H.S(M)Confdl.No.173/2023, dated 07.12.2023, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Bharath Chakkaravarthi, aged about 27 years, son of Lenin 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 Additional Chief Secretary of Government,

Page 6 of 8



H.C.P.(MD) No.669 of 2024

WEB COPY

Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.

- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Thoothukudi District,
Thoothukudi.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.
AND



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.669 of 2024

K.RAJASEKAR, J.
am

H.C.P.(MD) No.669 of 2024

24.07.2024