



HCP(MD)No.1039 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 30.08.2022

CORAM

The Honourable Mr. Justice **P.N.PRAKASH**
and
The Honourable Mrs. Justice **R.HEMALATHA**

H.C.P.(MD)No.1039 of 2022

Subramani Muthu

... Petitioner/ father of
the detenu

Vs

1.The Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise (IX) Department
Secretariat, Chennai-9.

2.The District Magistrate and District Collector
Virudhunagar District
Virudhunagar.

3.The Superintendent of Central 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 relating to the impugned order of detention passed by the 2nd respondent in Cr.M.P.No.10/2021 (Sexual Offender) dated 04.10.2021, quash the same and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the body or person of the detenu S.Muthupandi, aged 38, S/o.Subramani, now detained in Central Prison, Madurai and set him at liberty.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1039 of 2022

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Pandian

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by **R.HEMALATHA, J.**]

The petitioner is the father of the detenu viz., S.Muthupandi, aged about 38 years, S/o.Subramani. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Detention Order Cr.M.P.No.10/2021 (Sexual Offender) dated 04.10.2021 holding him to be a "Goonda", 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



HCP(MD)No.1039 of 2022

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 Detention Order in question was passed on 04.10.2021. The petitioner made a representation dated 11.10.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 22.10.2021. The remarks were duly received on 26.10.2021. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 30.11.2021.



HCP(MD)No.1039 of 2022

WEB COPY

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 4 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, out of which, there were 2 days Government holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay 2 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 26.10.2021 and there was a delay of 33 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, there were 11 days Government holidays and hence, there was inordinate delay of 22 days in considering the representation.

7. 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.

8. In **Sumaiya vs. The Secretary to Government (2007 (2) MWN**



HCP(MD)No.1039 of 2022

(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.

9. 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.

10. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 2 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 22 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.

11. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Detention Order Cr.M.P.No.10/2021 (Sexual Offender) dated 04.10.2021 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz.,



HCP(MD)No.1039 of 2022

Muthupandi, S/o.Subramani, aged about 38 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

(P.N.P.,J.) (R.H.,J.)
30.08.2022

Internet : Yes

RR

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise (IX) Department
Secretariat, Chennai-9.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector
Virudhunagar District
Virudhunagar.
- 3.The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Central Prison, Madurai.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1039 of 2022

P.N.PRAKASH,J.
and
R.HEMALATHA,J.

RR

H.C.P.(MD)No.1039 of 2022

30.08.2022