



WEB COPY



HCP.No.444 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 05.06.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.444 of 2024

Ammu

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The Addl. Secretary to 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 Principal Secretary to the Government,
Department of Co-operation,
Food and Consumer Protection Department,
2nd Floor, Namakkal Kavignar Maaligai,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
- 3.District Collector and District Magistrate,
Krishnagiri District, Krishnagiri.
- 4.The Superintendent of Police,
Krishnagiri District, Krishnagiri.
- 5.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Vellore.
- 6.The Inspector of Police,



HCP.No.444 of 2024

Civil Supplies CID Police Station,
Krishnagiri District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the third respondent dated 14.02.2024 in S.C.No.03/2024 (CS) against the petitioner's husband Saravanan, Male, aged about 41 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 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 Saravanan, aged about 41 years, S/o.Mani, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the third respondent dated 14.02.2024 slapped on her husband, branding him as "Black Marketeer" under the Prevention of Black Marketing and Maintenance of Supplies of Essential Commodities Act, 1980 (Central Act No.7 of 1980).



HCP.No.444 of 2024

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 26.02.2024. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, though the representation is dated 26.02.2024, the same has been received by the Government only on 29.02.2024; the file has been dealt with by the Secretary Law on 26.04.2024 and the Minister concerned dealt with the file on 26.04.2024 and the Rejection Letter was prepared on 26.04.2024 and sent to the detenu on 26.04.2024. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that the delay of 40 days 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. State of Tamil Nadu*', reported in '*(1999) 1 SCC 417*'.



HCP.No.444 of 2024

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 26.02.2024, which was received by the Government on 29.02.2024 and further, the Minister concerned had dealt with the file of the detenu only on 26.04.2024 and the Rejection Letter was sent to the detenu on 26.04.2024. Thus, we find that there is a considerable delay of 40 days in considering the representation of the petitioner. This delay of 40 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 40 days. 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***



HCP.No.444 of 2024

(*cited supra*), it has been held as follows:

WEB COPY

“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 Hon'ble 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 40 days 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



HCP.No.444 of 2024

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 14.02.2024 in S.C.No.03/2024 (CS), is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Saravanan, aged about 41 years, S/o.Mani, 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]

05.06.2024

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
Sni



HCP.No.444 of 2024

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Addl. Secretary to 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 Principal Secretary to the Government,
Department of Co-operation,
Food and Consumer Protection Department,
2nd Floor, Namakkal Kavignar Maaligai,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
- 3.District Collector and District Magistrate,
Krishnagiri District, Krishnagiri.
- 4.The Superintendent of Police,
Krishnagiri District, Krishnagiri.
- 5.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Vellore.
- 6.The Inspector of Police,
Civil Supplies CID Police Station,
Krishnagiri District.
- 7.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.444 of 2024

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

Sni

H.C.P.No.444 of 2024

05.06.2024