



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 06.02.2018

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE S.VIMALA
AND
THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE T.KRISHNAVALLI

HCP [MD].No.1777 of 2017

B.Rengarajan : Petitioner
Vs.

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

2.The Secretary to Government,
Tamilnadu Co-operation,
Food and Consumer Protection Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-9.

3.The State represented by
Inspector of Police,
Civil Supplies,
Criminal Investigation Department,
Tirunelveli, Tirunelveli District.

4.Jailer/Additional Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli District.

5.The Secretary to the Government,
Food and Consumer Protection Department,
Government of India,
Room No.270, New Delhi. : 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 of the first respondent passed in his proceedings in MHS. Confdl.No.128/2017, dated 29.11.2017 and quash the same and set the detainee namely M.Sundar, S/o.Muppidathi Thevar about 40 years now confined at fourth respondent's Central Prison, Payalamkottai at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Prahalad Ravi



For R-5

: C.Nandagopal

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by S.VIMALA, J]

WEB COPY

The petitioner is the cousin of the detenu viz., M.Sundar, S/o.Muppidathi Thevar, aged about 40 years. The detenu has been detained, as per the order of the first respondent, dated 29.11.2017, under Section 3(2) (a) read with 3(1) of the Prevention of Black Marketing and Maintenance of Supplies of Essential Commodities Act 1980 (Central Act 7 of 1980), branding him as "Black Marketer". Challenging the same, the petitioner has come up with this Habeas Corpus Petition.

2.We have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondents 1 to 4 and the learned counsel for the fifth respondent. 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 29.11.2017. As against the same, the petitioner made a representation dated 30.11.2017. The remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 11.12.2017. The remarks were received on 14.12.2017. Thereafter, the Government considered the issue and passed the order rejecting the representation on 22.12.2017. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was delay of 3 days in submitting the remarks by the detaining authority.

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>

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. In the decision in *JAYANARAYAN SUKUL v. STATE OF WEST BENGAL* reported in AIR 1970 SC 675, it has been held that the Government has to be vigilant in the governance of the citizens and that the representation should be considered as early as possible without any delay.

12. If any representation is received prior to passing the order of detention, the four principles are to be followed in letter and spirit, which reads as follows:-

"First, the appropriate authority is bound to give an opportunity to the detenu to make a representation and to consider the representation of the detenu as early as possible. Secondly, the consideration of the representation of the detenu by the appropriate authority is entirely independent of any action by the Advisory Board. Thirdly, there should not be any delay in the matter of consideration. It is true that no hard and fast rule can be laid down as to measure the time taken by the appropriate authority for consideration but it has to be remembered that the Government has to be vigilant in the governance of the citizens. A citizen's right raises a correlative duty of the State. Fourthly, the appropriate Government is to exercise its opinion and judgment on the representation before sending the case along with the detenu's representation to the Advisory Board."

13. 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 3 working days and therefore, the impugned detention order is liable to be quashed.

14. In the result, this Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and



the impugned Detention Order, passed by the first respondent, in his proceedings in M.H.S. Confdl.No.128/2017, dated 29.11.2017, is quashed. The detenu, namely, M.Sundar, S/o.Muppidathi Thevar, aged about 40 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 (CS-III)

WEB COPY

/True copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

- 1.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tirunelveli District, Tirunelveli.
- 2.The Secretary to Government,
Tamilnadu Co-operation,
Food and Consumer Protection Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-9.
- 3.The State represented by
Inspector of Police, Civil Supplies,
Criminal Investigation Department,
Tirunelveli, Tirunelveli District.
4. The Jailer/Additional Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli District.
(in duplicate for communication to the detenu)
- 5.The Secretary to the Government,
Food and Consumer Protection Department,
Government of India,
Room No.270, New Delhi.
- 6.The Joint Secretary,
Public (Law and Order) Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai.
- 7.The Additional Public Prosecutor
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

HCP [MD].No.1777 of 2017
06.02.2018

LS/RJ2

KK/SV MMS/SAR 4/06.02.2018/ 4P- 9C/

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>