



HCP(MD)No.1978 of 2021

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 16.09.2022

CORAM

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

H.C.P.(MD)No.1978 of 2021

Karuppayee

... Petitioner / Wife of the Detenue

Vs.

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

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

3.The Inspector of Police,
Shanarpatti Police Station,
Dindigul District.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Madurai.

...Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to
issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the



HCP(MD)No.1978 of 2021

detention order passed by the second respondent in Detention Order No.101 of 2021 dated 11.11.2021 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu namely Seenivasan, S/o.Palanichamy, male aged 55 years who is detained at Central Prison, Madurai before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Anand

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., Seenivasan, S/o.Palanichamy, aged 55 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Detention Order No.101 of 2021 dated 11.11.2021 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. 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.1978 of 2021

WEB COPY

5.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor, on instructions, submitted that the investigation was completed and final report was filed and it was taken on file by the Fast Track Mahila Court, Dindigul, in Spl.S.C.No.41 of 2022. It was further submitted that already nine witnesses have been examined in this case and case is now posted for examination of other witnesses.

6.The Detention Order in question was passed on 11.11.2021. The petitioner made a representation dated --.12.2021. The remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 21.12.2021. The remarks were duly received on 30.12.2021. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 18.04.2022.

7.It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 9 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 2 days were Government holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 7 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the



HCP(MD)No.1978 of 2021

remarks were received on 30.12.2021 and there was a delay of 104 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, 35 days were Government Holidays and hence, there was inordinate delay of 69 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



HCP(MD)No.1978 of 2021

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 7 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 69 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 Detention Order No.101 of 2021 dated 11.11.2021 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Seenivasan, S/o.Palanichamy, aged 55 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.)
16.09.2022

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes



HCP(MD)No.1978 of 2021

To:

WEB COPY

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



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1978 of 2021

J. NISHA BANU,J.

and

N. ANAND VENKATESH,J.

sm

H.C.P.(MD)No.1978 of 2021

16.09.2022