



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 20.06.2022

Coram

The Honourable Mr. Justice PARESH UPADHYAY
and
The Honourable Mr. Justice A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

H.C.P.No.1401 of 2021

Chithra

.. Petitioner

Vs

State represented by

1. The Secretary to Government (Home),
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Nagapattinam District.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison, Thiruchirappalli,
Thiruchirappalli District.
4. The Superintendent of Police,
O/o.Superintendent of Police,
Nagapattinam District.
5. The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Nagapattinam, Nagapattinam District.

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records pertaining to the order of detention order 14.07.2021 passed by the 2nd respondent bearing No.C.O.C.No.24/2021 and quash the same and produce the detenu Mathavan, aged about 32 years, S/o.Duraisamy, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith from the Central Prison, Thiruchirappalli.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Thirumoorthy

For Respondents : Mr.M.Babu Muthumeeran
Addl. Public Prosecutor



ORDER

PARESH UPADHYAY, J.
and
A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

WEB COPY

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu Mathavan, aged about 32 years, S/o.Duraisamy. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C.O.C.No.24/2021 dated 14.07.2021, holding him to be a "Sexual Offender", as contemplated under Section 2(ggg) of 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 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 on behalf of the petitioner was not considered in time and there was an inordinate and unexplained delay.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor 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.

5. The Detention Order in question was passed on 14.07.2021. A representation was made on behalf of the petitioner on 23.08.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 25.08.2021. The remarks were duly received on 03.09.2021. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the representation on 20.10.2021.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 9 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which, 3 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 6 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the



remarks were received on 03.09.2021 and there was a delay of 47 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Home, Prohibition and Excise Department after the Deputy Secretary dealt with it, of which, 18 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was an inordinate delay of 29 days in considering the representation.

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. In *Tara Chand vs. State of Rajasthan and others*, reported in 1980 (2) SCC 321, the Honourable Supreme Court has held that any inordinate and unexplained delay on the part of the Government in considering the representation renders the very detention illegal.

10. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 6 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 29 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Home, Prohibition and Excise Department. 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 C.O.C.No.24/2021 dated 14.07.2021, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Mathavan, aged about 32 years, S/o.Duraisamy, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CO)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

nsd/19



To

1. The Secretary to Government (Home),
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Nagapattinam District.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison, Thiruchirappalli,
Thiruchirappalli District.
4. The Superintendent of Police,
O/o.Superintendent of Police,
Nagapattinam District.
5. The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Nagapattinam,
Nagapattinam District.
6. The Joint Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Public, Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.
7. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.1401 of 2021

EV(CO)
CT/24/06/2022