

THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 06.11.2017

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

H.C.P.No.1578 of 2017

V.Venkatesan Petitioner/Parental uncle
of the detenu

-vs-

1. The Secretary to Government,
Department of Consumer Affairs,
Government of India, "Krishi Bhavan"
New Delhi - 110 001.
2. The Secretary to the Government,
Co Operation Food and Consumer
Protection Dept., Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.
3. District Collector and District Magistrate,
Vellore District,
Vellore. Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the third respondent 27.07.2017 in C3.D.O.No.74/2017 against the petitioner cousin son Saravanan, Male aged 35 years S/o.Mani, who is confined at Central Prison, Vellore and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before the Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Senthil Vel

For Respondent : Mr.Arokiam for R1
Mr. V.M.R.Rajentran for R2 & R3
Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

[Order of the Court was made by N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.]

The petitioner is the Uncle of the detenu, namely, Thiru.Saravanan, S/o.Mani, Male, aged about 35 years. The detenu has been detained by the 3rd respondent by his order in C3.D.O.No.74/2017, dated 27.07.2017, holding him to be a "Black marketeer", as contemplated under provision of Prevention of Black Marketing and Maintenance of Supplies of Essential Commodities Act, 1980 (Act No.7 of 1980). The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.

2.We have heard the learned counsel 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 in time and there was an inordinate and unexplained delay with regard to the same.

4.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor 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.

5.The Detention Order in question was passed on 27.07.2017. The petitioner made a representation, dated 11.08.2017 and nil and the same was received on 17.08.2017. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on the same day i.e., on 18.08.2017. The remarks were duly received on 16.10.2017. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 24.10.2017.

6.It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 58 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 21 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 37 days in submitting the remarks.

7. In Rekha vs. State of Tamil Nadu, reported in 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, reported in 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.

9. In Tara Chand vs. State of Anbazhagansthan 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 37 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority. 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 C3.D.O.No.74/2017, dated 27.07.2017, passed by the 3rd respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Thiru.Saravanan, S/o.Mani, Male, aged about 35 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case. Given the nature of the case, this order will be communicated to the concerned Jail Superintendent by the Registrar General of this Court via Fax.

सत्यमेव जयते

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS VIII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

ggs/pam

To:

1. The Secretary to Government,
Department of Consumer Affairs,
Government of India, "Krishi Bhavan"
New Delhi - 110 001.
2. The Secretary to the Government,
Co Operation Food and Consumer
Protection Dept., Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.
3. District Collector and District Magistrate,
Vellore District,
Vellore.
4. The Joint Secretary,
Public, Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.
5. The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Vellore.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Madras.

+1cc to Mr.S.Arockiam, Advocate Sr. 78334

H.C.P.No.1578 of 2017

VR(06/11/2017)

सत्यमेव जयते

WEB COPY