



HCP(MD)No.266 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 23.09.2022

CORAM

**THE HON'BLE MRS JUSTICE J. NISHA BANU
AND
THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH**

H.C.P.(MD)No.266 of 2022

Palanisamy

.. Petitioner /detenu

Vs.

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
State of Tamilnadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The District Magistrate and District Collector
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector
Pudukottai District.

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

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the entire records connected with the detention order of the respondent No.2 in P.D.O.No.71/2021 dated 27.12.2021 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Palanisamy son of Maruthai, aged



HCP(MD)No.266 of 2022

about 56 years, now confining at Trichy Central Prison, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Alagumani

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

J. NISHA BANU,J.

and

N. ANAND VENKATESH,J.

The petitioner is the detenu viz., Palanisamy, aged about 56 years, S/o.Maruthai. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in PDO No.71/2021 dated 27.12.2021 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



HCP(MD)No.266 of 2022

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 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 has been completed and final report has already been filed before the Mahila Court, Pudukottai, and the same is yet to be taken on file.



HCP(MD)No.266 of 2022

6. The Detention Order in question was passed on 27.12.2021. The petitioner made a representation dated 17.02.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 22.02.2022. 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 remarks were received on 24.03.2022 and there was a delay of 59 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, 21 days were a Government Holiday and hence, there was inordinate delay of 38 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.



HCP(MD)No.266 of 2022

WEB COURT

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 38 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. There shall be a direction to the learned Sessions Judge, to immediately act upon the final report and proceed in accordance with law.

12. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in P.D.O.No.71/2022 dated 27.12.02.2021 passed by the second



HCP(MD)No.266 of 2022

respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Palanisamy, S/o.Maruthai, aged about 56 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

(J.N.B.,J.) (N.A.V.,J.)
23.09.2022

Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes

RR

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
State of Tamilnadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector
Pudukottai District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Trichy Central Prison,
Trichy.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.266 of 2022

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

RR

H.C.P.(MD)No.266 of 2022

23.09.2022