



H.C.P.(MD)No.1961 of 2021

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 14.10.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE J. NISHA BANU

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH

H.C.P.(MD)No.1961 of 2021

R.Kayathri

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.

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

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

.. Respondents



H.C.P.(MD)No.1961 of 2021

WEB COPY

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the entire records connected with the detention order passed in M.H.S.Confdl.No.182/2021, dated 08.12.2021 on the file of the second respondent and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu or body of the detenu namely, the petitioner's husband i.e., Rajavel, son of Murugan, aged about 31 years, now detained at the Central Prison, Palayamkottai before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Pragalathan

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

J.NISHA BANU, J.

and

N.ANAND VENKATESH, J.

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Rajavel, son of Murugan, aged about 31 years. The detenu has been detained by the second



H.C.P.(MD)No.1961 of 2021

respondent by his order in M.H.S.Confdl.No.182/2021, dated 08.12.2021 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.



H.C.P.(MD)No.1961 of 2021

WEB COPY

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 submitted that the investigation was completed and final report was filed and the case is now pending on the file of the POCSO Court, Tirunelveli in Spl.S.C.No.10 of 2022. The victim girl was examined in chief and the detenu did not cross examine her. The learned counsel for the detenu submitted that the petition under Section 311 of Cr.P.C was filed in Cr.M.P.No.3058 of 2022 and the same is posted under the caption for orders, today.



H.C.P.(MD)No.1961 of 2021

6. The Detention Order in question was passed on 08.12.2021.

The petitioner made a representation dated 20.12.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 23.12.2021. 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 there was a delay of 126 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Electricity, Prohibition and Excise Department after the Deputy Secretary dealt with it, in which 39 days were Government Holidays, and hence there was an inordinate delay of 87 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.



H.C.P.(MD)No.1961 of 2021

WEB COPY

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 87 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 M.H.S.Confdl.No.182/2021, dated 08.12.2021 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Rajavel, son of



H.C.P.(MD)No.1961 of 2021

Murugan, aged about 31 years, 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.)
14.10.2022

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes
rm



H.C.P.(MD)No.1961 of 2021

Copy to

WEB COPY

1. The Principal Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai
Tirunelveli.
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.1961 of 2021

J.NISHA BANU,J.

and

N.ANAND VENKATESH, J.

rm

H.C.P.(MD)No.1961 of 2021

14.10.2022