



HCP No.588 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED: 21.12.2022

Coram

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH
and
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.ANAND VENKATESH**

H.C.P.No.588 of 2022

R.Muthusamy
S/o.Ramasamy

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu
represented by
Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Perambalur District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Perambalur District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Trichy.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Perambalur.

... Respondents



HCP No.588 of 2022

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records of the second respondent pertaining to the order made in Cr.M.P.No.09/2022 dated 02.03.2022 in detaining the detenu under the Tamil Nadu Act 14/1982 as a "Sexual Offender" and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu, namely, Raj S/o.Muthusamy, aged 21 years, who is detained at the Central Prison, Tiruchirapalli, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.R.Kuyilan

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Made by **P.N.PRAKASH, J.**]

The petitioner is the father of the detenu viz., Raj S/o.Muthusamy, aged 21 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Cr.M.P.No.09/2022 dated 02.03.2022, holding him to be a "Sexual Offender", as contemplated under Section 2(ggg) of the 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.

3. Though several grounds have been raised in the Habeas Corpus Petition, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would mainly focus his argument 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 by the petitioner was not considered on time and there was an inordinate and unexplained delay.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor strongly opposed the Habeas Corpus Petition. 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.



HCP No.588 of 2022

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that the detenu was arrested on 20.01.2022 and remanded to judicial custody. The investigation was completed and final report was filed before the Additional Sessions & District Court, Mahila Court, Perambalur, on time, on 23.01.2022 and it was taken on file in P.R.C.No.14 of 2022.

6. The Detention Order in question was passed on 02.03.2022. The petitioner made a representation dated 15.03.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 23.03.2022. The remarks were duly received on 24.03.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 23.05.2022.

7. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 55 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 19 days were Government holidays and hence, there was an inordinate delay of 36 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 24.03.2022 and there was a delay of 6



HCP No.588 of 2022

days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Home, P&E after the Deputy Secretary dealt with it, of which 2 days were Government holidays. Hence, there was inordinate delay of 4 days in considering the representation.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. In **Tara Chand vs. State of Rajasthan and others**, reported in **1980 (2) SCC 321**, the Honourable Supreme Court has held that any



HCP No.588 of 2022

inordinate and unexplained delay on the part of the Government in considering the representation renders the very detention illegal.

11. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 36 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 4 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Home, P&E. 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 Cr.M.P.No.09/2022 dated 02.03.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Raj S/o.Muthusamy, aged 21 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[PNP, J.] [NAV, J.]
21.12.2022

Index: Yes/No
gm/gya



HCP No.588 of 2022

To

WEB COPY

- 1.The Additional Sessions & District Court,
Mahila Court, Perambalur.
- 2.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
- 3.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Perambalur District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Police,
Perambalur District.
- 5.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Trichy.
- 6.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Perambalur.
- 7.The Joint Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Public, Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 9.
- 8.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP No.588 of 2022

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

gm/gya

H.C.P.No.588 of 2022

21.12.2022