



H.C.P.No.2111 of 2021

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 14.10.2022

Coram

The Honourable Mr. Justice **P.N.PRAKASH**
and
The Honourable Mr. Justice **RMT.TEEKAA RAMAN**

H.C.P.No.2111 of 2021

Pushparani

.. Petitioner

Vs

- 1.State of Tamil Nadu represented by
The Secretary of Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai-9.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Salem, Salem District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Salem, Salem District.
- 4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Salem.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Attur, Salem District.
(Crime No.11/2021)

.. Respondents



H.C.P.No.2111 of 2021

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to

issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records leading to the detention of petitioners husband the detenu Mahendran, aged 47 years, son of Rangasamy, presently detained in the Central Prison, Salem, under Act 14/1982 as Sexual Offender *vide* the detention order dated 23.10.2021 in C.M.P.No.37/Sexual Offender/C2/2021 on the file of the second detenu Mahendran, aged 47 years, son of Rangasamy, before this Court and thereafter set her at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Vasudevan

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Addl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Mady by *P.N.PRAKASH, J.*)

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu Mahendran, aged 47 years, son of Rangasamy. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C.M.P.No.37/Sexual Offender/C2/2021 dated 23.10.2021, 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.



H.C.P.No.2111 of 2021

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 detenu 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.



H.C.P.No.2111 of 2021

WEB COPY

5. The Detention Order in question was passed on 23.10.2021. A representation was made on behalf of the detenu on 22.11.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 23.11.2021. The remarks were duly received on 20.12.2021. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the representation on 03.01.2022.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 27 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which, 8 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 19 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 20.12.2021 and there was a delay of 14 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, 4 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was an inordinate delay of 10 days in considering the representation.



H.C.P.No.2111 of 2021

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 19 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 10 days in considering



H.C.P.No.2111 of 2021

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.M.P.No.37/Sexual Offender/C2/2021 dated 23.10.2021, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz. Mahendran, aged 47 years, son of Rangasamy, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

(P.N.P., J.) (TKRJ)
14.10.2022

Index: Yes/No
nsd



H.C.P.No.2111 of 2021

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Secretary of Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai-9.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Salem, Salem District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Salem, Salem District.
- 4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Salem.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Attur, Salem 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.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2111 of 2021

P.N.PRAKASH, J.
and
RMT.TEEKAA RAMAN, J.

nsd

H.C.P.No.2111 of 2021

14.10.2022