



HCP(MD)No.281 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.276 of 2022

Pandiselvi

.. Petitioner /wife of the
detenu

Vs.

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

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Dindigul District,
Dindigul.

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

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records of the impugned detention order No.11/2022 dated 02.02.2022 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same as illegal and to direct the respondents to produce the detenu Poosari Murugan @ Murugan, male, aged 47 years, son of Ocha Thevar,



HCP(MD)No.281 of 2022

now detained at the Central Prison, Madurai, before this Court and set him at liberty.

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 wife of the detenu viz., Poosari Murugan @ Murugan, aged about 47 years, S/o.Ocha Thevar. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in detention order No. 11/2022 dated 02.02.2022 holding him to be a "Drug Offender", as contemplated under Section 2(e) 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 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 transferred to the file of NIBCID and the arrest was effected on 29.01.2022 and the investigation was completed



HCP(MD)No.281 of 2022

and final report was filed on 24.06.2022 (within 180 days) in filing No. 1117/2022. The case has been taken on file by the Principal NDPS Court, Madurai, in C.C.No.389/2022 and it is now at the stage of framing of charges.

6. The Detention Order in question was passed on 02.02.2022. The petitioner made a representation dated 16.02.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 21.02.2022. The remarks were duly received on 04.03.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 18.04.2022.

7. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 10 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 4 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 04.03.2022 and there was a delay of 40 days, in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Electricity, Prohibition and Excise Department after the Deputy Secretary



HCP(MD)No.281 of 2022

dealt with it, of which, 14 days were a Government Holiday and hence, there was inordinate delay of 26 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 inordinate and unexplained delay on the part of the Government in considering the representation renders the very detention illegal.



HCP(MD)No.281 of 2022

11. 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 26 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.

12. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in detention order No.11/2022 dated 02.02.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Poosari Murugan @ Murugan, S/o.Ochathevar, aged about 47 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



HCP(MD)No.281 of 2022

To

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

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Dindigul District,
Dindigul.

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

4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.281 of 2022

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

RR

H.C.P.(MD)No.281 of 2022

23.09.2022