



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED :23.07.2021

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.KALYANASUNDARAM
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE B.PUGALENDHI**

H.C.P. (MD) No.313 of 2021

Gunasekaran

... Petitioner/son of the detenu

-vs-

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

2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector,
Pudukkottai District,
Pudukkottai.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Trichy Central Prison,
Trichy District.

... Respondents

PRAYER : Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issue of a Writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the entire records connected with the detention order of the second respondent in P.D.O.No.71 of 2020, dated 16.09.2020 and to quash the same and to direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Murugappan, son of Chinnakannu, aged about 57 years, now detained as 'Sexual Offender' in Trichy Central Prison before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.M.Karunakaran

For Respondents : Mr.T.Senthil Kumar,
Standing Counsel for the State



O R D E R

(Order of the Court was made by K.KALYANASUNDARAM, J.)

This habeas corpus petition has been filed by the son of the detenu, namely, Murugappan, son of Chinnakannu, aged about 57 years, challenging the detention order in detention order in P.D.O.No.71 of 2020, dated 16.09.2020, passed by the second respondent, branding him as "Sexual Offender" as contemplated under Section 2(ggg) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982.


2. Mr.K.M.Karunakaran, learned counsel for the petitioner, would argue that even though the petitioner has raised several grounds, he has confined his arguments only to the delay in disposal of the petitioner's representation. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the procedural safeguards guaranteed under Articles 21 and 22 of the Constitution of India have not been followed in this case and there is unexplained and inordinate delay in disposal of the petitioner's representation, which would vitiate the impugned order of detention.

3. Mr.T.Senthil Kumar, learned Standing Counsel for the State, on instructions, submitted that after satisfying with the materials placed by the Sponsoring Authority, the Detaining Authority has passed the 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.

4. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

5. In the instant case, the pro-forma furnished by the learned Stranding Counsel appearing for the respondents would indicate that as against the impugned detention order, the petitioner made a representation to the first respondent on 26.09.2020 and it was received on 24.10.2020. Remarks were called for on the same day i.e. 24.10.2020 and it was received on 16.11.2020. The Deputy Secretary dealt with the matter on 16.11.2020. The concerned Minister dealt with the matter on 23.11.2020 and the representation came to be rejected on 23.11.2020. It is seen that in between 24.10.2020 and 16.11.2020, there was a delay of 22 days, after excluding the Government Holidays of 7 days, there was a delay of 15 days in the first part and in between 16.11.2020 and 23.11.2020, there was a delay of 6 days, after excluding the Government Holiday of one day, there was a delay of 5 day in the second part, in considering the petitioner's representation.

6. At this juncture, it is useful to refer the decision of the Honourable Apex Court in the case of **Rajammal vs. State of Tamil Nadu and another**, reported in **1999 (1) SCC 417**, wherein, the Apex



Court has observed and held that it is for the Authority concerned to explain the delay, if any, in disposal of the representation and if any delay was caused on account of nay indifference or lapse in considering the representation, such delay will adversely affect further detention of the prisoner.

WEB COPY

7. In the case on hand, as stated supra, the delay of 20 days in considering the representation of the petitioner remains unexplained by the respondents. Hence, in our considered view, the detention order is liable to be set aside solely on the ground of delay by following the decision of the Honourable Apex Court referred supra.

8. In fine, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detention order in detention order in P.D.O.No.71 of 2020, dated 16.09.2020, passed by the second respondent, is set aside. Consequently, the detenu, namely, Murugappan, son of Chinnakannu, aged about 57 years, who is now detained at Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli is directed to be released forthwith unless his presence or custody or detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (Records)

// True Copy //

/ /2021

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)


Vsn

Note :

In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the advocate / litigant concerned.

To:

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



2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector,
Pudukkottai District,
Pudukkottai.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Trichy Central Prison,
Trichy District.

4.The Joint Secretary to Government
Public(Law & Order) Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai-9.

5.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

H.C.P. (MD) No.313 of 2021
23.07.2021

MGJ(03.08.2021) 4P 6C