



HCP(MD)No.480 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 10.07.2024

CORAM

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

H.C.P.(MD)No.480 of 2024

A.Abhilasha

... Petitioner / Wife of the Detenu

Vs.

1.The Additional Secretary to Government of India,
Department of Consumer Affairs,
Food and Consumer Affairs Department,
Room No.270, Krishibavan,
New Delhi – 110 001.

2.The Secretary to Government,
Cooperation, Food and Consumer Protection
Department, Namakkal Kavignar Maaligai,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.

3.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Tenkasi District,
Tenkasi.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli District.

... Respondents



HCP(MD)No.480 of 2024

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records connected with the detention order passed in M.H.S.Confdl No.15/2024 dated 15.03.2024 on the file of the third respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu or body of the detenu namely the petitioner's husband i.e., Anvarkhan, aged about 34 years, S/o.Jamaludeen, now detained at the Central Prison, Palayamkottai, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner	: Mr.N.Pragalathan
For R-1	: Mr.K.Govindarajan Deputy Solicitor General of India
For R-2 to R-4	: Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA,J.)

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Anvarkhan, aged about 34 years, S/o.Jamaludeen. The detenu has been detained by the third respondent by his order in M.H.S.Confdl No.15/2024 dated 15.03.2024 holding him to be a "Black Marketer", as contemplated under the provisions of Tamil Nadu Act 7 of 1980. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.



HCP(MD)No.480 of 2024

WEB COPY

2. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, learned Deputy Solicitor General of India 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, 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 12.04.2024. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, though the representation is dated 12.04.2024, the same was received by the Government on 16.04.2024 and the rejection letter was sent to the detenu on 05.06.2024. There is a delay of 33 days in considering the petitioner's representation. The said delay of 33 days in considering the representation remains unexplained and the same vitiates the impugned detention order. In support of his contention, the 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***.



HCP(MD)No.480 of 2024

4. The 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 12.04.2024, which was received by the Government on 16.04.2024 and the rejection letter was sent to the detenu on 05.06.2024. As per the proforma submitted by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, there is a delay of 33 days 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 33 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 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



HCP(MD)No.480 of 2024

considered is whether the delay caused has been properly explained by the authorities concerned. But, in the instant case, the inordinate delay of 33 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.

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.



HCP(MD)No.480 of 2024

11. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in M.H.S.Confdl No.15/2024 dated 15.03.2024 passed by the third respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Anvarkhan, S/o.Jamaludeen, aged about 34 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.)
10.07.2024

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Lm

To

1.The Additional Secretary to Government of India,
Department of Consumer Affairs,
Food and Consumer Affairs Department,
Room No.270, Krishibavan,
New Delhi – 110 001.

2.The Secretary to Government,
Cooperation, Food and Consumer Protection
Department, Namakkal Kavignar Maaligai,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.

3.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Tenkasi District,
Tenkasi.



HCP(MD)No.480 of 2024

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli District.

5.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.480 of 2024

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA,J.
and
K.RAJASEKAR,J.

Lm

H.C.P.(MD)No.480 of 2024

10.07.2024