



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED :29.07.2021

CORAM:

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

H.C.P. (MD) No.1112 of 2020

Sathiyavani

... Petitioner/wife of the detenu

-vs-

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu, represented by
The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise(XVI) Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-9.
 - 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector,
Dindigul District,
Dindigul.
 - 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Madurai.
 - 4.The Inspector of Police,
Vadamadurai Police Station,
Dindigul District.
 - 5.Mr.Ramesh Kumar,
Special Public Prosecutor for NDPS Cases,
Madurai.
- ... Respondents

(R4 and R5 are suo-motu impleaded as per order of this Court,
dated 25.6.2021, made in H.C.P(MD)Nos.1112, 989 and1008 of 2020)

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 in Detention Order No.66 of 2020, dated 20.10.2020, on the file of the second respondent and to set aside the same as illegal and to direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the Petitioner's husband namely, Sonaimuthu, son



of Murugesan, aged 31 years, who is detained in Central prison, Madurai. before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Baskaran

For Respondents : Mr.S.Ravi,
Standing Counsel for the State

WEB COPY

O R D E R

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


This habeas corpus petition has been filed by the wife of the detenu, namely, Sonaimuthu, son of Murugesan, aged about 31 years, challenging the detention order in Detention Order No.66 of 2020, dated 20.10.2020, passed by the second respondent, branding him as "Drug Offender" as contemplated under Section 2(e) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982.

2. Mr.V.Baskaran, 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.S.Ravi, 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 Standing Counsel for the State would indicate that as against the impugned detention order, the petitioner made a representation to the first respondent on 20.11.2020 and it was received on 23.11.2020. Remarks were called for on the same day i.e. 23.11.2020 and it was received on 4.12.2020. The Deputy Secretary dealt with the matter on 5.12.2020. The concerned Minister dealt with the matter on 9.1.2021 and the representation came to be rejected on 11.1.2021. It is seen that in between 5.12.2020 and 9.1.2021, there was a delay of 34 days, after excluding the Government Holidays of 9 days, there was a delay of 25



days 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.

7. In the case on hand, as stated supra, the delay of 25 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 No.66 of 2020, dated 20.10.2020 passed by the second respondent, is set aside. Consequently, the detenu, namely, Sonaimuthu, son of Murugesan, aged about 31 years who is now detained at Central Prison, Madurai is directed to be released forthwith unless his 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)

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 Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise(XVI) Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-9.



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

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Madurai.

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

5. The Inspector of Police,
Vadamadurai Police Station,
Dindigul District.

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

H.C.P. (MD) No.1112 of 2020

29.07.202

MGJ(05.08.2021) 4P 7C