



HCP(MD)No.367 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: **02.12.2022**

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH
AND
THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH

H.C.P.(MD)No.367 of 2022

R.Padmavathy

... Petitioner / Wife of the Detenue

Vs.

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Additional Chief Secretary to the Government,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Dindigul District, Dindigul.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Dindigul District, Dindigul.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Kodaikanal.
- 5.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison Madurai,
Madurai.

...Respondents



HCP(MD)No.367 of 2022

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records pertaining to the Detention Order No.12 of 2022, dated 16.02.2022 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein and set aside the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the Petitioner's husband Ramasundaram, S/o.Chokku, aged 67 years, now confined in the Central Prison, Madurai, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.K.M.Appaji

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar

Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by **N. ANAND VENKATESH, J.**)

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Ramasundaram, S/o.Chokku, aged 67 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Detention Order No.12 of 2022, dated 16.02.2022 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 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.



HCP(MD)No.367 of 2022

WEB COPY

5.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor, on instructions, submitted that the investigation was completed and a final report was filed on time on 24.03.2022 and the same has been taken on file on 04.04.2022 in Spl.S.C.No.51 of 2022 before the Mahila Court (FTC), Dindigul. It was further submitted that the case is now at the stage of trial.

6.The Detention Order in question was passed on 16.02.2022. The petitioner made a representation dated 03.03.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 04.04.2022. The remarks were duly received on 06.05.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 12.05.2022.

7.It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 31 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 11 days were Government holidays and hence, there was an inordinate delay of 20 days in submitting the remarks.



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.

11.In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 20 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority. The impugned detention order is, therefore, liable to be quashed.



HCP(MD)No.367 of 2022

WEB COPY

12.In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Detention Order No.12 of 2022, dated 16.02.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Ramasundaram, S/o.Chokku, aged 67 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

(M.S.R.,J.) (N.A.V.,J.)
02.12.2022

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes
Sm



HCP(MD)No.367 of 2022

To:

WEB COPY

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to the Government,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Dindigul District, Dindigul.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Dindigul District, Dindigul.
4. The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Kodaikanal.
5. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison Madurai,
Madurai.
6. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.367 of 2022

M.S. RAMESH, J.

and

N. ANAND VENKATESH, J.

Sm

H.C.P.(MD)No.367 of 2022

02.12.2022