



H.C.P.No.2508 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 28.02.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.2508 of 2023

Lakshmi

... Petitioner/Mother of detenu

Vs.

1. The State rep by its
The Additional Secretary to Government,
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 Magistrate and District Collector
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector
Erode District.
4. The Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Superintendent of Police, Erode District.



H.C.P.No.2508 of 2023

5. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison at Coimbatore, Gandhipuram,
Coimbatore 012

6. The Inspector of Police,
Civil Supplies Criminal Investigation Department,
Erode Unit

... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records in Detention order No.Cr.M.P.30/Black Marketer/2023/C-1 dated 27.11.2023 on the file of the 3rd respondent herein and set aside the same, direct the respondents herein to produce the body of detenu namely Sakthivel, S/o. Janarthanan, aged 35 years before this Hon'ble Court, now confined in Central Prison at Coimbatore and set him at liberty.

For petitioner	: Ms.R.Subadra Devi
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, mother of the detenu has filed this Petition challenging the order of detention passed by the 3rd respondent against his son in Cr.M.P. No.30/Black Marketer/2023 C1 dated 27.11.2023, branding the



H.C.P.No.2508 of 2023

detenu as a "BLACK MARKETEE" as contemplated under the provision of Prevention of Black Marketing and Maintenance of Supplies of Essential Commodities Act, 1980 (Central 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 02.01.2024. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, the representation dated 02.01.2024 was received by the Government belatedly on 22.01.2024 and thereafter, the file has been dealt with by the Deputy Secretary only on 23.02.2024 i.e. nearly after 32 days, by the Minister concerned on 27.02.2024 and the Rejection Letter was prepared and sent to the detenu 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. State of Tamil Nadu, reported in (1999) 1 SCC 417.***



H.C.P.No.2508 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 02.01.2024, which was received by the Government belatedly on 22.01.2024, was dealt with by the Minister concerned only on 27.02.2024 and the Rejection Letter was prepared on the same day. Thus, we find there is a considerable delay of Twenty four days [after excluding the intervening Saturday and Sunday and Public Holidays [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.



H.C.P.No.2508 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."



H.C.P.No.2508 of 2023

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 23.01.2024 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 Government in disposing of the representation of the detenu.

9. Accordingly, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the



H.C.P.No.2508 of 2023

detention order in Cr.M.P. No.30/Black Marketer/2023 C1 dated 27.11.2023, passed by the 3rd respondent is quashed. The detenu, namely Sakthivel, aged 35 years, S/o. Janarthanan, 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]
28.02.2024

bga

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No



H.C.P.No.2508 of 2023

To

WEB COPY

1. The Additional Secretary to Government,
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 Magistrate and District Collector
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector
Erode District.
4. The Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Superintendent of Police, Erode District.
5. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison at Coimbatore, Gandhipuram,
Coimbatore 012
6. The Inspector of Police,
Civil Supplies Criminal Investigation Department,
Erode Unit
7. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.
8. The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2508 of 2023

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

bga

H.C.P.No.2508 of 2023

28.02.2024