



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 01.03.2021

CORAM:

WEB COPY

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.KALYANASUNDARAM
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.ILANGO VAN**

H.C.P. (MD) No.1033 of 2020

Saravanan

... Petitioner

-vs-

1. State of Tamil Nadu,
rep. by the Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort, St. George,
Chennai - 9.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
O/o The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Theni District,
Theni
- 3.The Superintendent,
Special Prison for Women,
Madurai.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Incharge Rajathani Circle,
Theni District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a writ of habeas corpus calling for the entire records in detention order passed in Detention Order No.63/2020 dated 04.11.2020 on the file of the second respondent herein and set aside the same as illegal and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's mother namely, Devi, W/o Sahathevan female, aged 50 years, who is detained in Special Prison for Women, Madurai before this Court and set her at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Mahendrapathy

For Respondents : Mr.K.Dinesh Babu
Additional Public Prosecutor



O R D E R

[Order of the Court was made by K.KALYANASUNDARAM, J.]

The Habeas Corpus Petition has been filed by the son of the detenu, namely, Devi, wife of Sahathevan, female aged about 50 years, who has been branded as "Drug Offender" by the second respondent in Detention Order No.63/2020 dated 04.11.2020, as contemplated under Section 2(e) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982.

2.Though several grounds have been raised challenging the impugned order of detention passed by the second respondent, dated 04.08.2020, Mr.S.Mahendrapathy, learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the procedural safeguards guaranteed under Articles 21 and 22 of the Constitution of India has been violated and there is an inordinate and unexplained delay in considering the representation of the petitioner and on this sole ground, the detention order is liable to be set aside.


3.Per contra, Mr.K.Dinesh Babu, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents would argue that the detaining authority, namely, the second respondent herein, after being satisfied with the materials produced by the sponsoring authority, has passed the detention order only to prevent the detenu from indulging in similar offence in future, which would prejudice to the maintenance of the public order. He would further state that the delay, if any, in considering the representation would not cause any prejudice to the detenu and there is no infirmity or irregularity in the order of detention passed by the second respondent. Hence, he prayed for dismissal of the Habeas Corpus Petition.

4.We have heard the rival submissions and perused the materials available on records.

5.In the instant case, it is not in dispute that the detenu was detained by the order of the second respondent dated 04.11.2020. Aggrieved over the same, a representation dated 13.11.2020 has been sent to the first respondent and the same was received on 17.11.2020 and on the same day, remarks were called for and the same were received on 03.12.2020. The Deputy Secretary dealt with the matter on 03.12.2020. The concerned Minister dealt with the matter on 09.01.2021 and thereafter, the detenu's representation was rejected on 12.01.2021. It is seen that there was delay of 37 days between 03.12.2020 and 09.01.2021. It is also seen that there are 9 Government holidays and after excluding the same, there is a delay of 28 days in considering the representation of the detenu.

6.In the case of **Rajammal vs. State of Tamil Nadu and another (1999 (1) SCC 417)** the Honourable Apex Court observed and held that

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>



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 any 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, there is absolutely no explanation for the delay of 28 days in considering the representation of the detenu. 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 order of detention passed by the second respondent, in Detention Order No.63/2020 dated 04.11.2020, is set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. Consequently, the detenu, namely, Devi, wife of Sahathevan, female, aged about 50 years, now detained at Special Prison for Women, Madurai is directed to be released forthwith unless her presence or custody or detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (AD-II)

// True Copy //

/ /2021

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

Skn

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 Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort, St. George,
Chennai - 9.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
O/o The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Theni District,
Theni

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>



3.The Superintendent,
Special Prison for Women,
Madurai.

4.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Incharge Rajathani Circle,
Theni District.

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

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

H.C.P. (MD) No.1033 of 2020
01.03.2021

VB (15.03.2021) 4P 7C