



WEB COPY



HCP.No.236 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 15.04.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.236 of 2024

Dhanapathi

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Additional Secretary to Government of India,
Ministry of Consumer Affairs,
Food and Public Distribution,
Room No.270, Krishi Bhavan,
New Delhi – 110 001.

2.The Principal Secretary to the Government,
Department of Co-operation,
Food and Consumer Protection Department,
2nd Floor, Namakkal Kavignar Maligai,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.

3.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
O/o. the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Cuddalore District, Cuddalore.

4.The Superintendent of Police,
Cuddalore District, Cuddalore.

5.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Cuddalore.



HCP.No.236 of 2024

6.The Inspector of Police,
Civil Supplies CID Police Station,
Cuddalore & District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, call for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the third respondent on 10.01.2024 in C3.D.O.No.04/2024 against the petitioner's husband Ravichandran, Male aged 42 years, S/o.Ayyamperumal, who is confined at Central Prison, Cuddalore and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Balaji

For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak,
Additional Public Prosecutor
assisted by Mr.C. Aravind

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the wife of the detenu namely Ravichandran, aged about 42 years, S/o.Ayyamperumal, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the third respondent dated 10.01.2024 slapped on her husband, branding



HCP.No.236 of 2024

him as "Black Marketeer" under the Prevention of Black marketing and Maintenance of Supplies of Essential Commodities Act, 1980 (Central Act 7 of 1980).

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

3. Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner focused mainly on the ground that there is an unexplained delay in considering the representation of the petitioner, dated 24.01.2024. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, though the representation is dated 24.01.2024, the same has been received by the Government only on 30.01.2024; the file has been dealt with by the Secretary Law on 26.02.2024 and the Minister concerned dealt with the file only on 27.02.2024 and the Rejection Letter was prepared on 28.02.2024 and served to the detenu on 02.03.2024. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that the delay of 20 days in considering the representation remains unexplained and the same vitiates the detention order. In support of his contention, the learned counsel for



HCP.No.236 of 2024

the petitioner relied on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Rajammal Vs. State of Tamil Nadu, reported in (1999) 1 SCC 417.***

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 petitioner is dated 24.01.2024, which was received by the Government on 30.01.2024 and further, the Minister concerned had dealt with the file of the detenu only on 27.02.2024 and the Rejection Letter was served to the detenu on 02.03.2024. Thus, we find there is a considerable delay of 20 days in considering the representation of the petitioner. This delay of 20 days in considering the petitioner's representation remains unexplained.

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 delay of 20 days. Therefore, we have to hold that the



HCP.No.236 of 2024

delay has vitiated further detention of the detenu.

WEB COPY

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."

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 of 20 days has not been properly explained at all.

7. Further, in a recent decision in ***Ummu Sabeena vs. State of***



HCP.No.236 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 discussion, we have no hesitation in quashing the order of detention on the ground of delay on the part of the Government in disposing of the representation of the petitioner.

9. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the third respondent on 10.01.2024 in C3.D.O.No.04/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenue viz., Ravichandran, aged about 42 years, S/o.Ayyamperumal, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R., J] [S.M., J]
15.04.2024

kas

To



HCP.No.236 of 2024

WEB COPY

1.The Additional Secretary to Government of India,
Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution,
Room No.270, Krishi Bhavan,
New Delhi – 110 001.

2.The Principal Secretary to the Government,
Co-operation, Food and Consumer Protection Department,
2nd Floor, Namakkal Kavignar Maligai,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.

3.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
O/o. the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Cuddalore District,
Cuddalore.

4.The Superintendent of Police,
Cuddalore District,
Cuddalore.

5.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Cuddalore.

6.The Inspector of Police,
Civil Supplies CID Police Station,
Cuddalore & District.

7.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras,
Chennai 600 104



WEB COPY



HCP.No.236 of 2024

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

kas

H.C.P.No.236 of 2024

15.04.2024