



H.C.P.(MD) No.258 of 2024

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 07.06.2024

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR**

H.C.P.(MD) No.258 of 2024

Thamaraiselvi

... Petitioner

-vs-

- 1.The Secretary to Government
Department of Food and Consumer Protection
Ministry of Consumer Affairs
Food and Public Distribution System
Government of India
Room No.270, Krishi Bhavan
New Delhi-110 001
- 2.The State of Tamil Nadu
rep.by its Additional Chief Secretary to Government
Food, Co-operation and Consumer Protection Department
Secretariat
St.George Fort, Chennai-600 009
- 3.The District Magistrate and
District Collector
Pudukottai District
Pudukottai



H.C.P.(MD) No.258 of 2024

WEB COPY

4.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison
Tiruchirappalli

5.The Inspector of Police
CSCID Police Station
Pudukottai Range
Pudukottai District

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the entire records in detention order in P.D.O.No.01 of 2024, dated 19.01.2024, on the file of the third respondent and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the body of the petitioner's husband, namely, Senthilkumar, son of Ravuthan, aged about 45 years, now confined in Central Prison, Thiruchirappalli, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.M.A.Jinna

For Respondents : Mr.K.Govindarajan
Deputy Solicitor General of India for R1
Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor for R2 to R5



WEB COPY

H.C.P.(MD) No.258 of 2024

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.]

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Senthilkumar, son of Ravuthan, aged about 45 years. The detenu has been detained by the third respondent by his order in P.D.O.No.01 of 2024, dated 19.01.2024, holding him to be a "Black Marketeer", as contemplated under the provisions of Prevention of Black Marketing and Maintenance of Supplies of Essential Commodities Act, 1980 (Act No.7 of 1980). The said order is under challenge in this habeas corpus petition.

2. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents. We have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.

3. Though several grounds have been raised in the habeas corpus petition, learned counsel for the petitioner focused mainly on the ground that there is an unexplained delay in considering the representation of the petitioner, dated 09.01.2024. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, though the representation is dated 09.01.2024, the same was



H.C.P.(MD) No.258 of 2024

WEB COPY

received by the Government on 13.02.2024 and the rejection letter was sent to the detenu on 19.03.2024. There is a delay of seven days in Column Nos.7 to 9 of the Proforma in considering the petitioner's representation. The said delay of seven days in considering the representation remains unexplained and the same vitiates the impugned detention order. In support of his contention, learned counsel for the petitioner relied on the Judgment of the Honourable Supreme Court in ***Rajammal vs. State of Tamil Nadu***, reported in ***(1999) 1 SCC 417***.

4. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor, on instructions, submitted that after satisfying with the materials placed by the Sponsoring Authority, the Detaining Authority has passed the impugned detention order and there is no illegality or infirmity in the detention order. It is also stated that even if there is any delay in disposal of the representation, it has not caused any prejudice to the rights of the detenu and hence, prayed for dismissal of the habeas corpus petition

5. 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 09.01.2024, which was received by the Government on 13.02.2024



H.C.P.(MD) No.258 of 2024

WEB COPY

and the rejection letter was sent to the detenu on 19.03.2024. As per the proforma submitted the by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, there is a delay of seven days in Column Nos.7 to 9 in considering the representation of the petitioner and we find that the said delay remains unexplained.

6. 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 seven days. Therefore, we have to hold that the delay has vitiated further detention of the detenu.

7. In the above cited decision of the Honourable Supreme Court in ***Rajammal***'s case, 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



H.C.P.(MD) No.258 of 2024

WEB COPY

clause (5) of Article 22 convey the message that the representation should be considered and disposed of at the earliest."

8. 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, in the instant case, the inordinate delay of seven days has not been properly explained.

9. Further, in a recent decision in ***Ummu Sabeena vs. State of Kerala-2011 STPL (Web) 999 SC***, the Honourable 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.



WEB COPY

H.C.P.(MD) No.258 of 2024

10. 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.

11. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in P.D.O.No.01 of 2024, dated 19.01.2024, passed by the third respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Senthilkumar, son of Ravuthan, aged about 45 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[A.D.J.C., J.] [K.R.S., J.]

07.06.2024

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No

krk

To:

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



H.C.P.(MD) No.258 of 2024

WEB COPY

- 2.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Food, Co-operation and Consumer Protection Department,
Secretariat,
St.George Fort, Chennai-600 009.
- 3.The District Magistrate and
District Collector,
Pudukottai District,
Pudukottai.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
CSCID Police Station,
Pudukottai Range,
Pudukottai District.
- 6.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.258 of 2024

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.
AND
K.RAJASEKAR, J.
krk

H.C.P.(MD) No.258 of 2024

07.06.2024