



HCP(MD)No.605 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.605 of 2022

Marudhuveeran @
Madhuraiveeran

.. Petitioner /detenu

Vs.

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,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Virudhunagar District.

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

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records connected with the detention order of the Respondent No.2 in Cr.M.P.No.02/2022(Sexual offender) dated 23.02.2022 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Marudhuveeran @



HCP(MD)No.605 of 2022

Madhuraiveeran, S/o.Manthiri, aged about 49 years, now detained at Madurai Central Prison, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : M/s.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., Marudhuveeran @ Madhuraiveeran, S/o.Manthiri, aged about 49 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Cr.M.P.No.02/2022 dated 23.02.2022 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 counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the detaining authority has relied upon the bail order granted in Cr.M.P.No.119 of 2020 dated 24.02.2020, whereas the copy of the order was not provided to the detenu.

5. 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.605 of 2022

6.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor, on instructions, submitted that investigation has been completed and final report has been filed before the POCSO Court, Srivilliputhur, and the same is taken on file in Special S.C.No.40 of 2022. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor further submitted that the case is posed on 06.10.2022.

7.The Detention Order in question was passed on 23.02.2022. The petitioner made a representation dated 19.03.2022. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 28.03.2022. The remarks were duly received on 06.04.2022. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 11.04.2022.

8. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 8 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 2 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 06.04.2022 and there was a delay of 4 days, in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Electricity,



HCP(MD)No.605 of 2022

Prohibition and Excise Department after the Deputy Secretary dealt with it, of which, 2 days were a Government Holiday and hence, there was inordinate delay of 2 days in considering the representation.

9. 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.

10. 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.

11. 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.605 of 2022

12.The detaining authority has stated that the detenu has not filed any bail petition and has relied upon the order passed in Cr.M.P.No.119 of 2020, dated 24.02.2020 and rendered a finding as if the bail was granted in a similar case. On going through the materials that were furnished to the detenu, it is seen that the bail order was not provided to the detenu and it is not available. Hence, the detaining authority has come to a conclusion that there is a likelihood of the detenu being released on bail, without any supporting material. It, therefore, reflects non-application of mind.

13.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 2 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.

14. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Cr.M.P.No.02/2022 dated 23.02.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Marudhuveeran @ Madhuraiveeran, S/o.Manthiri, aged about 49 years, is directed to be



HCP(MD)No.605 of 2022

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

Ns

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,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Virudhunagar District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Madurai Central Prison,
Madurai District.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.605 of 2022

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

Ns

H.C.P.(MD)No.605 of 2022

23.09.2022