



HCP(MD)No.543 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 30.09.2022

CORAM

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

H.C.P.(MD)No.543 of 2022

Mariyammal

... Petitioner / Wife of the
Detenu

Vs.

1. The Government of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Virudhunagar District, Virudhunagar.
3. The Inspector of Police,
Appanyaickenpatti Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to



HCP(MD)No.543 of 2022

issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records connected with the detention order passed by the Respondent No.2 in Cr.M.P.No.3/2022 dated 21.03.2022 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu, by name, Karuppasamy, aged about 50 years, son of Karuppasamy, now detained at Central Prison, Madurai, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Sekar

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar

Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

J. NISHA BANU,J.

and

N. ANAND VENKATESH,J.

The petitioner is the detenu viz., Karuppasamy, aged about 50 years, son of Karuppasamy. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his detention order in Cr.M.P.No.3/2022 dated 21.03.2022 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.543 of 2022

WEB COPY

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor, on instructions, submitted that the investigation was completed and final report was filed before the POCSO Court, Srivilliputhur, and the same was taken on file in Spl.C.C.No.90 of 2022. He further submitted that the case is now at the stage of trial.

6.The Detention Order in question was passed on 21.03.2022. The petitioner made a representation dated 01.04.2022. The remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 11.04.2022. The remarks were duly received on 11.05.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 16.05.2022.

7.It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 28 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 11 days were Government holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 17 days in submitting the remarks.



WEB COPY

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 17 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining



HCP(MD)No.543 of 2022

Authority. The impugned detention order is, therefore, liable to be quashed.

WEB COPY

12. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Cr.M.P.No.3/2022 dated 21.03.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Karuppasamy, aged about 50 years, son of Karuppasamy, 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.)
30.09.2022

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes
PJJ

To:

1. The Principal Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli.



HCP(MD)No.543 of 2022

WEB COPY

3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli.

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



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.543 of 2022

J. NISHA BANU,J.

and

N. ANAND VENKATESH,J.

PJL

H.C.P.(MD)No.543 of 2022

30.09.2022