



H.C.P.(MD)No.143 of 2022

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 06.09.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE J. NISHA BANU

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH

H.C.P.(MD)No.143 of 2022

T.Rani

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Department of Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.

2.The District Collector cum District Magistrate,
Thanjavur District,
Thanjavur.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Trichy.

.. Respondents



H.C.P.(MD)No.143 of 2022

WEB COPY

PRAYER: 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 proceedings of the second respondent made in proceedings in P.D. No.145/2021 dated 28.11.2021 and quash the same and set the petitioner's son / the detenu namely, Periyasamy, son of Thangaraj, aged about 29 years, at liberty from Central Prison, Trichirappalli.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Mahendran
For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

J.NISHA BANU, J.
and
N.ANAND VENKATESH, J.

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu viz., Periyasamy, son of Thangaraj, aged about 29 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in P.D.No.145/2021 dated 28.11.2021 holding him to be a "Sexual Offender", as contemplated under Section



H.C.P.(MD)No.143 of 2022

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 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 by filing his counter. He would submit that



H.C.P.(MD)No.143 of 2022

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 learned Additional Public Prosecutor, on instructions, submitted that the investigation was completed and final report was filed and it was taken on file by the Principal District Judge, Thanjavur, in S.C.No.182 of 2022 and the case stands posted for hearing on 19.09.2022.

6. The Detention Order in question was passed on 28.11.2021. The petitioner made a representation dated 04.01.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 07.01.2022. The remarks were duly received on 12.01.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 16.06.2022.



H.C.P.(MD)No.143 of 2022

WEB COPY

7. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 4 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 2 days were Government holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 2 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 12.01.2022 and there was a delay of 122 days, in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Electricity, Prohibition and Excise Department after the Deputy Secretary dealt with it, of which, 50 days were a Government Holiday and hence, there was inordinate delay of 72 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.



H.C.P.(MD)No.143 of 2022

WEB COPY

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 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 2 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 72 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Electricity, Prohibition and Excise Department. The impugned detention order is, therefore, liable to be quashed.



H.C.P.(MD)No.143 of 2022

WEB COPY Copy to

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Department of Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector cum District Magistrate,
Thanjavur District,
Thanjavur.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Trichy.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.143 of 2022

J.NISHA BANU,J.

and

N.ANAND VENKATESH, J.

rm

H.C.P.(MD)No.143 of 2022

06.09.2022