



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 03.11.2017

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE R. SUBBIAH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.D. JAGADISH CHANDIRA

H.C.P. (MD) No. 1181 of 2017

M. Lakshmi

: Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Additional Secretary
Government of India
Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food and
Public Distribution (Department of Consumer Affairs)
Room No. 270 Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi. 110 001.
2. The Secretary
Government of Tamilnadu
Cooperation, Food and Consumer Protection Department
Secretariat, Fort St. George, Chennai.
3. The District Collector and District Magistrate
Madurai District, Madurai.
4. The Inspector of Police,
CSCID, Madurai
5. The Superintendent
Central Prison, Madurai

: Respondents

PRAYER: Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issue of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records pertaining to the order of detention passed by the third respondent in his proceedings in C.M.P.No.1 of 2017 (CS) dated 25.07.2017 and quash the same as illegal and produce the detenu, namely Arun @ Arun Pandian, son of Muthu @ Sonaimuthu, aged about 25 years, now he is confined in Central Prison, Madurai, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr. T. Leninkumar

For Respondents : Mr. C. Ramesh for R2 to R5
Additional Public Prosecutor
Mr. R. Murugappan for R1
Central Government Standing Counsel

**ORDER**

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

WEB COPY

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu viz., Arun @ Arunpandian, S/o.Muthu @ Sonaimuthu, aged about 25 years. The detenu has been detained, as per the order of the third respondent, dated 25.07.2017, under Section 3(1) read with 3(2)(a) of the Prevention of Black Marketing and Maintenance of Supplies of Essential Commodities Act, 1980 branding him as "BLACK MARKEETEER". Challenging the same, she has come up with this Habeas Corpus Petition.

2.We have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondents. We have also perused the records carefully.

3.Though several grounds have been raised in the Habeas Corpus Petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner would mainly focus his argument on the ground that there is violation of procedural safeguards, which are guaranteed under Articles 21 and 22 of the Constitution of India. The learned counsel would submit that the representation made by the petitioner was not considered on time and there was an inordinate and unexplained delay. The learned counsel has relied on few Judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Based on the same, the learned counsel would plead for setting aside the detention order.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would, however, oppose this Habeas Corpus Petition. He would submit that though there was delay in considering the representation, on that score, the impugned detention order need not be interfered with, as on account of the said delay, 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. We have considered the above submissions.

6. In this case, the Detention Order was passed on 25.07.2017. As against the same, the petitioner made a representation on 01.08.2017. The remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 03.08.2017. The remarks were received on 16.08.2017. Thereafter, the Government considered the issue and passed the order rejecting the representation on 14.09.2017. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 8 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority.



7. Now, the question is as to whether on that score, the impugned order can be quashed.

8. In **Rekha Vs. State of Tamil Nadu**, [2011 (5) SCC 244], the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the right to life and liberty of a person is protected, under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has further 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 of 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/detenu would be sufficient to set aside the detention order.

10. In **Tara Chand Vs. State of Rajasthan and others**, [1980 (2) SCC 321], the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that any inordinate and unexplained delay on the part of the Government in considering the representation renders the detention illegal. This dictum has been followed in several Judgments consistently by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as this Court.

11. Applying the said dictum laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, if we look into the facts of the present case, undoubtedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 8 working days and therefore, the impugned detention order is liable to be quashed.

12. In the result, this Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the impugned Detention Order, passed by the third respondent, in his proceedings in C.M.P.No.1 of 2017 (CS) dated 25.07.2017, is quashed. The detenu, namely Arun @ Arun Pandian, son of Muthu @ Sonaimuthu, aged about 25 years, is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith, if he is not required for detention in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(AE)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1. The Additional Secretary

Government of India

Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food and

<https://hcservices.courts.gov.in/hcservices/> Public Distribution (Department of Consumer Affairs)

Room No.270 Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi. 110 001.



2. The Secretary
Government of Tamilnadu
Cooperation, Food and Consumer Protection Department
Secretariat, Fort St. George, Chennai.

WEB COPY

3. The District Collector and District Magistrate
Madurai District, Madurai.

4. The Inspector of Police,
CSCID, Madurai

5. The Superintendent
Central Prison, Madurai.

6. The The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law & Order)
Fort St. George, Chennai -9

7. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

+1cc to Mr.R.Murugappan, Advocate Sr.No.85263

+1cc to Mr.T.Leninkumar, Advocate Sr.No.85450

RR

VB/KK/SAR1/16/11/2017/4P/10C

Order made in
H.C.P. (MD) No.1181 of 2017
Dated: 03.11.2017