



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.66 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 11.03.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.66 of 2024

S. Mahalakshmi

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. Union of India

Represented by its Secretary to Government of India,
Ministry of Consumer Affairs,
Food and Public Distribution
(Department of Consumer Affairs)
Room No.270, "Krish Bhavan", New Delhi 110 001.

2. The State of Tamil Nadu,

Represented by its Secretary to the Government,
Food and Consumer Protection Department,
2nd Floor, Namakkal Kavignar Maaligai,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.

3. District Magistrate & Collector

O/o. The District Magistrate and Collector,
Thiruvallur District, Tiruvallur.

4. The Superintendent of Prison,



H.C.P.No.66 of 2024

Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai 600 066

5. The Superintendent of Police,
O/o. The Superintendent of Police
Tiruvallur District, Tiruvallur.

6. The Inspector of Police,
Civil Supplies CID,
Tiruvallur

... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records relating to the impugned order of detention passed by the 3rd respondent in PBMMSECA No.03/2023 dated 09.12.2023 and set aside the same and consequently direct the respondents to produce the detenu Vetrivel, Son of Sivakumar, aged about 30 years, petitioner's son now confined at Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For petitioner : Mr.R. Mahadevan

For Respondents : Mr.E. Raj Thilak

Additional Public Prosecutor

Assisted by Aravind.C

ORDER

M.S.RAMESH, J.

and

SUNDER MOHAN, J.

The Petitioner, mother of the detenu has filed this Petition challenging the order of detention passed by the 3rd respondent against her son, in



H.C.P.No.66 of 2024

PBMMSECA No.03/2023 dated 09.12.2023, branding the detenu as a "Black Marketer" contemplated under the Prevention of Black Marketing and Maintenance of Supplies of Essential Commodities Act, 1980 (Central Act 7 of 1980).

2. Even though the learned counsel for the petitioner raised many grounds in assailing the impugned order of detention in the petition, he confined his arguments only to the ground of delay in considering the representation of the detenu, dated 21.12.2023. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, the representation dated 21.12.2023, was received by the Government belatedly on 26.12.2023 and thereafter the file has been dealt with by the Deputy Secretary only on 23.02.2024, i.e. nearly after 60 days, and by the Minister concerned on 27.02.2024 and the Rejection Letter was prepared and sent on the same day. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that this inordinate delay in considering the representation remains unexplained and the same vitiates the detention order. In support of his contention, the learned counsel for the petitioner relied on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Rajammal vs.***



H.C.P.No.66 of 2024

State of Tamil Nadu, reported in (1999) 1 SCC 417.

WEB COPY

3. Heard the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

4. As per the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner and on perusal of the records, we find that, the representation of the detenu, dated 21.12.2023, which was received by the Government on 26.12.2023, was dealt with by the Minister concerned only on 27.02.2024, i.e. nearly after 64 days of its submission, and the Rejection Letter was prepared on the same day. Thus, we find there is a considerable delay of forty days [after excluding the intervening Saturday and Sunday and Public Holidays [30.12.2023, 31.12.2023, 01.01.2024, 06.01.2024, 07.01.2024, 13.01.2024, 14.01.2024, 15.01.2024, 16.01.2024, 17.01.2024, 20.01.2024, 21.01.2024, 25.01.2024, 26.01.2024, 27.01.2024, 28.01.2024, 03.02.2024, 04.02.2024, 10.02.2024, 11.02.2024, 17.02.2024, 18.02.2024, 24.02.2024, 25.02.2024]] in considering the representation of the petitioner. This inordinate delay in considering the detenu's representation remain unexplained.



WEB COPY

5. It is trite law that the representation should be very expeditiously considered and disposed of with a sense of urgency and without avoidable delay. Any unexplained delay in the disposal of the representation would be a breach of the constitutional imperative and it would render the continued detention impermissible and illegal. From the records produced, we find that no acceptable explanation has been offered for the inordinate delay. Therefore, we have to hold that the delay has vitiated further detention of the detenu.

6. In the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Rajammal's case*** (*cited supra*), it has been held as follows:

"It is a constitutional obligation of the Government to consider the representation forwarded by the detenu without any delay. Though no period is prescribed by Article 22 of the Constitution for the decision to be taken on the representation, the words "as soon as may be " in clause (5) of Article 22 convey the message that the representation should be considered and disposed of at the earliest."



H.C.P.No.66 of 2024

WEB COPY

As per the dictum laid down by the Supreme Court in above cited ***Rajammal's case***, number of days of delay is immaterial and what is to be considered is whether the delay caused has been properly explained by the authorities concerned. But, here the inordinate delay from 27.12.2023 to 27.02.2024, has not been properly explained at all.

7. Further, in a recent decision in **Ummu Sabeena vs. State of Kerala - 2011 STPL (Web) 999 SC**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the history of personal liberty, as is well known, is a history of insistence on procedural safeguards. The expression 'as soon as may be', in Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India clearly shows the concern of the makers of the Constitution that the representation, made on behalf of the detenu, should be considered and disposed of with a sense of urgency and without any avoidable delay.

8. In the light of the above fact and law, we have no hesitation in quashing the order of detention on the ground of delay on the part of the



H.C.P.No.66 of 2024

Government in disposing of the representation of the detenu.

WEB COPY 9. Accordingly, the habeas corpus petition is allowed and the detention order in PBMMSECA No.03/2023 dated 09.12.2023, passed by the 3rd respondent is quashed. The detenu, viz., Vetrivel, aged 30 years, S/o. Sivakumar, is directed to be set at liberty, forthwith, unless his presence is required in connection with any other case.

**[M.S.R., J] [S.M., J]
11.03.2024**

bga

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No



H.C.P.No.66 of 2024

To

WEB COPY

1. Union of India
Represented by its Secretary to Government of India,
Ministry of Consumer Affairs,
Food and Public Distribution
(Department of Consumer Affairs)
Room No.270, "Krish Bhavan", New Delhi 110 001.
2. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by its Secretary to the Government,
Food and Consumer Protection Department,
2nd Floor, Namakkal Kavignar Maaligai,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
3. District Magistrate & Collector
O/o. The District Magistrate and Collector,
Thiruvallur District, Tiruvallur.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai 600 066
5. The Superintendent of Police,
O/o. The Superintendent of Police
Tiruvallur District, Tiruvallur.
6. The Inspector of Police,
Civil Supplies CID
Tiruvallur
7. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.
8. The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.66 of 2024

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
SUNDER MOHAN, J.

bga

H.C.P.No.66 of 2024

11.03.2024