

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED: 23..12..2022

Coram

The Honourable Mr. Justice **P.N.PRAKASH**
and

The Honourable Mr. Justice **N.ANAND VENKATESH**

Habeas Corpus Petition No.1338 of 2022

Francisca


W/o Vincent Paulraj

..... Petitioner

-Versus-

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, St. George Fort, Chennai 600 011.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Kallakurichi District, Kallakurichi.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison, Cuddalore.
- 4.The Superintendent of Police,
Kallakurichi District.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Elavanasoorkottai Police Station,
Elavanasoorkottai,
Kallakurichi District.

.... Respondents



Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the 2nd respondent dated 08.06.2022 in D.O.No.C2/30/2022 against the petitioner's son viz., Jaison, male, aged 23 years, son of Vincent Paulraj at present who is confined at Central Prison Cuddalore, and set aside the same and consequently direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : *Mrs.S.Sujatha*

For Respondents : *Mr.R.Muniyapparaj,*
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by P.N.PRAKASH.J.,]

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu viz., Jaison, Son of Vincent Paulraj. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in D.O.No.C2/30/2022 dated 08.06.2022, 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.

WEB COPY 3. Though several grounds have been raised in the Habeas Corpus Petition, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would mainly focus on the ground that there is gross violation of procedural safeguards, which would vitiate the detention. The learned counsel, by placing authorities, submitted that the representation made on behalf of the detenu was not considered in time and there was an inordinate and unexplained delay.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor strongly opposed the Habeas Corpus Petition by filing his counter. He would submit that though there was delay in considering the representation, on that score alone, the impugned detention order cannot be quashed. According to the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, no prejudice has been caused to the detenu and thus, there is no violation of the fundamental rights guaranteed under Articles 21 and 22 of the Constitution of India.

5. The Detention Order in question was passed on 08.06.2022. A representation was made on behalf of the detenu on 21.06.2022 and remarks




were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority. Thereafter,

the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the representation on 11.07.2022.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 19 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Home, Prohibition and Excise Department after the Deputy Secretary dealt with it, of which, 6 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was an inordinate delay of 13 days in considering the representation.

7. In **Rekha vs. State of Tamil Nadu (2011 (5) SCC 244)**, the Honourable Supreme Court has held that the procedural safeguards are required to be zealously watched and enforced by the Courts of law and their rigour cannot be allowed to be diluted on the basis of the nature of the alleged activities undertaken by the detenu.

8. In **Sumaiya vs. The Secretary to Government (2007 (2) MWN (Cr.) 145)**, a Division Bench of this Court has held that the unexplained delay of three days in disposal of the representation made on behalf of the detenu would be sufficient to set aside the order of detention.



WEB COPY

9. In **Tara Chand vs. State of Rajasthan and others**, reported in


1980 (2) SCC 321, the Honourable Supreme Court has held that any inordinate and unexplained delay on the part of the Government in considering the representation renders the very detention illegal.

10. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 13 days days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Home, Prohibition and Excise Department. The impugned detention order is, therefore, liable to be quashed.

In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in D.O.No.C2/30/2022 dated 08.06.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu viz., Jaison, Son of Vincent Paulraj, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.


(P.N.P., J.) (N.A.V.,J.)
23..12..2022

Index: Yes/No
kmk



To
WEB COPY

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, St. George Fort, Chennai 600 011.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Kallakurichi District, Kallakurichi.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison, Cuddalore.
4. The Superintendent of Police,
Kallakurichi District.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Elavanasoorkottai Police Station,
Elavanasoorkottai,
Kallakurichi District.
6. The Joint Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Public, Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 9.
7. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

VERDICTUM.IN



H.C.P.No.1338 of 2022

P.N.PRAKASH.J.,
AND
N.ANAND VENKATESH.J.,

kmk

H.C.P.No.1338 of 2022

23..12..2022

Page 7 of 7