

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 07.09.2022

CORAM

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

H.C.P.(MD)No.626 of 2022

Saranya

.. Petitioner /Wife of the detenue

Vs.

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009.

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

3.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Ariyalur.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
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 records pertaining to the order of

detention passed by the second respondent in his proceedings Cr.M.P.No. 36/2021 dated 15.11.2021 and quash the same as illegal and produce the detenu namely Vijayan, S/o.Muthusamy, aged about 35 years, now he is confined in Central Prison, Trichy, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Leninkumar
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., Vijayan, aged about 35 years, S/o.Muthusamy. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Cr.M.P.No.36/2021 dated 15.11.2021 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 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 further submitted that the investigation was completed and final report was filed, which was taken on file by the Mahila Court, Ariyalur, in S.C.No.63 of

2021. He further submitted that there are totally 13 witnesses in this case and already 11 witnesses have been examined and the case stands posted on 15.09.2022 for examination of the Investigating Officer. It is, therefore, clear that the trial itself is nearing of completion.

6. The Detention Order in question was passed on 15.11.2021. The petitioner made a representation dated 29.12.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 05.01.2022. 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.

7. It is the contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 12.01.2022 and there was a delay of 154 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 104 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.

11. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 104 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 Cr.M.P.No.36/2021 dated 15.11.2021 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Vijayan, aged about 35 years, S/o.Muthusamy, 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.)
07.09.2022

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes
Ns

To

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

HCP(MD)No.626 of 2022

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

H.C.P.(MD)No.626 of 2022

07.09.2022