



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2420 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 19.02.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.2420 of 2023

Raja ... Petitioner/Son-in-law of detenu
Vs.

1. The Additional 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,
Food and Consumer Protection Department,
IInd Floor, Namakkal Kavingnar Maaligai,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
3. The District Collector and District Magistrate of
Vellore, Vellore District.
4. The Superintendent of Police,
Vellore District, Vellore,



H.C.P.No.2420 of 2023

5. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Vellore, Vellore District.

6. The Inspector of Police,
Civil Supply Crime Investigation Department,
Vellore, Vellore District.

... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the 3rd respondent dated 03.12.2023 in his office Ref C3.D.O. No.119/2023 against the petitioner's father-in-law Ganesan, S/o. Ramasamy, aged about 67 years, now confined at Central Prison, Vellore, Vellore District, and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the abovesaid detenu before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For petitioner	: Mr.E. Kannadasan
For R1	: Mr. Rajesh Vivekanandan, Deputy Solicitor General
For R2 to R6	: Mr.E. Raj Thilak Additional Public Prosecutor Assisted by Aravind.C

ORDER

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

The Petitioner, son-in-law of the detenu has filed this Petition challenging the order of detention passed by the 3rd respondent against his father-in-law, in C3.D.O. No.119/2023 dated 03.12.2023, branding the



H.C.P.No.2420 of 2023

detenu as a "BLACK MARKETEER" as contemplated under the provision of Prevention of Black Marketing and Maintenance of Supplies of Essential Commodities Act, 1980 (Act No.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 18.12.2023. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, though the representation dated 18.12.2023 was received by the Government belatedly on 22.12.2023, the file has been dealt with by the Deputy Secretary only on 29.01.2024 i.e. nearly after 38 days, by the Minister concerned on 03.02.2024 and the Rejection Letter was prepared on 06.02.2024 and sent to the detenu on 07.02.2024. 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. State of Tamil Nadu, reported in (1999) 1 SCC 417.***



H.C.P.No.2420 of 2023

WEB COPY

3. Heard the learned Deputy Solicitor General appearing for the 1st respondent and learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents 2 to 6.

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 18.12.2023, which was received by the Government belatedly on 22.12.2023, was dealt with by the Minister concerned only on 03.02.2024 and the Rejection Letter was prepared on 06.02.2024. Thus, we find there is a considerable delay of Twenty six days [after excluding the intervening Saturday and Sunday and Public Holidays [23.12.2023, 24.12.2023, 25.12.2023, 30.01.2023, 31.01.2023, 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 and 04.02.2024] in considering the representation of the petitioner. This inordinate delay in considering the detenu's representation remain unexplained.



H.C.P.No.2420 of 2023

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."

As per the dictum laid down by the Supreme Court in above cited



H.C.P.No.2420 of 2023

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 23.12.2023 to 06.02.2024, 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 Government in disposing of the representation of the detenu.



H.C.P.No.2420 of 2023

9. Accordingly, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the detention order in C3.D.O. No.119/2023 dated 03.12.2023, passed by the 3rd respondent is quashed. The detenu 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]
19.02.2024**

bga

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No



H.C.P.No.2420 of 2023

To

WEB COPY

1. The Additional 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,
Food and Consumer Protection Department,
IInd Floor, Namakkal Kavingnar Maaligai,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
3. The District Collector and District Magistrate of
Vellore, Vellore District.
4. The Superintendent of Police,
Vellore District, Vellore,
5. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Vellore, Vellore District.
6. The Inspector of Police,
Civil Supply Crime Investigation Department,
Vellore, Vellore District.
7. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.
8. The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2420 of 2023

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

bga

H.C.P.No.2420 of 2023

19.02.2024