

**(2006) 04 MAD CK 0131**

**In the Madras High Court**

**Case No : Habeas Corpus Petition No. 60 of 2006**

Jagadeesh

APPELLANT

Vs

The State of Tamil Nadu

RESPONDENT

---

**Date of Decision :** 04-04-2006

**Acts Referred:**

**Citation :** (2006) 04 MAD CK 0131

**Hon'ble Judges :** P. Sathasivam, J; J.A.K. Sampathkumar, J

**Bench :** Division Bench

**Advocate :** M.N. Balakrishnan, for the Appellant; Abudhukumar Rajarathinam, Government Advocate (Crl. Side), for the Respondent

**Final Decision :** Allowed

---

## **Judgement**

P. Sathasivam, J.—The petitioner by name Jagadeesh, who was detained as a ""Goonda"" as contemplated under the Tamil Nadu Prevention

of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video

Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982), by the impugned detention order dated 26.09.2005, challenges the same in this Petition.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Government Advocate for the respondents.

3. At the foremost, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there is enormous delay in disposal of the representation of the detenu, which

vitiates the ultimate order of detention. With reference to the above claim, learned Government Advocate has placed the details, which show that

the representation of the detenu dated 31.12.2005 was received by the Government on 02.01.2006 and remarks were called for on 03.01.2006.

Thereafter, the remarks were received by the Government on 10.01.2006 and the File was submitted on 12.01.2006 and the same was dealt with by the Under Secretary and the Deputy Secretary on the same date i.e. on 12.01.2006 and finally, the Minister for Prohibition and Excise passed orders on 13.01.2006. The rejection letter was prepared on 30.01.2006 and the same was sent to the detenu on the same date i.e., on 30.01.2006 and served to him on 04.02.2006 . As rightly pointed out by the learned counsel for the petitioner, though the Minister for Prohibition and Excise passed an order on 13.01.2006, there is no explanation at all for taking time for preparation of rejection letter till 30.01.2006. In the absence of any explanation by the person concerned even after excluding the intervening holidays, we are of the view that the time taken for preparation of rejection letter is on the higher side and we hold that the said delay has prejudiced the detenu in disposal of his representation. On this ground, we quash the impugned order of detention.

4. Accordingly, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the impugned order of detention is set aside. The detenu is directed to be set at liberty forthwith from the custody unless he is required in some other case or cause.