



H.C.P.(MD) No.607 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 09.09.2024

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.V. KARTHIKEYAN
and
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE J.SATHYA NARAYANA PRASAD**

H.C.P.(MD) No.607 of 2024

Vellaisamy

... Petitioner/Father of the detenu

Vs.

1. The Secretary to Government of India,
Ministry of Consumer Affairs,
Food and Public Distribution (Department of Consumer Affairs),
Room No.270, Krishibhavan
New Delhi - 110 001.

2. The Additional Chief Secretary
The Government of Tamil Nadu,
Co-Operation, Food and Consumer Protection Department,
2nd Floor, Namakkal Kavignar Maaligai
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.



H.C.P.(MD) No.607 of 2024

3. The Commissioner of Police,
Madurai City,
Madurai.

4. The Superintendent,
Central Prison
Madurai District.

5. The Jailer,
District Prison
Dindigul District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the order made in No. 01/PBMMSEC/2024 dated 09.05.2024 on the file of the third respondent and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's son namely, Pandivel, son of Vellaisamy, aged about 25 years, who is now detained as a detenu at District Prison, Dindigul District or his corpus or body before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.607 of 2024

For Petitioner : Mr.J.Sankara Pandian
For Respondents : Mr.V.B.Sundhareshwar – for R1
Central Government Counsel
Mr.S.Ravi – for R2 to R5
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

The petitioner is the father of the detenu viz., Pandivel, aged about 25 years. The detenu has been detained by the third respondent by his order in No.01/PBMMSEC/2024 dated 09.05.2024 holding him to be a "Black Marketeer", as contemplated under Section 3(1) read with Section 3(2)(b) of the Prevention of Black Marketing and Maintenance of Supplies of Essential Commodities Act, 1980 (Central Act 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, learned Central Government Counsel appearing for the first respondent and learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents 2 to 5. We have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.



H.C.P.(MD) No.607 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 16.05.2024. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, though the representation is dated 16.05.2024, the same was received by the Government on 20.05.2024 and the rejection letter was sent to the detenu on 24.06.2024 and the Ministry dealt with the same on 21.06.2024. There is a delay of 28 days in Column Nos.6 to 9 and 10 to 12 of the Proforma dated 09.08.2024 in considering the petitioner's representation. The said delay of 24 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



H.C.P.(MD) No.607 of 2024

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 16.05.2024, which was received by the Government on 20.05.2024 and the rejection letter was sent to the detenu on 24.06.2024. As per the proforma submitted by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, there is a delay of 24 days in Column Nos.6 to 9 and 10 to 12 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



H.C.P.(MD) No.607 of 2024

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 24 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



H.C.P.(MD) No.607 of 2024

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 24 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.



H.C.P.(MD) No.607 of 2024

WEB COPY

11. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in No.01/PBMMSEC/2024 dated 09.05.2024 passed by the third respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Pandivel, son of Vellaisamy, aged about 25 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[C.V.K., J.] [J.S.N.P., J.]

09.09.2024

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

RM



H.C.P.(MD) No.607 of 2024

WEB COPY

To

1. The Secretary to Government of India,
Ministry of Consumer Affairs,
Food and Public Distribution (Department of Consumer Affairs),
Room No.270, Krishibhavan
New Delhi - 110 001.

2. The Additional Chief Secretary
The Government of Tamil Nadu,
Co-Operation, Food and Consumer Protection Department,
2nd Floor, Namakkal Kavignar Maaligai
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.

3. The Commissioner of Police,
Madurai City,
Madurai.

4. The Superintendent,
Central Prison
Madurai District.

5. The Jailer,
District Prison
Dindigul District.

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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.607 of 2024

C.V. KARTHIKEYAN, J.
AND
J.SATHYA NARAYANA PRASAD, J.

RM

H.C.P.(MD) No.607 of 2024

09.09.2024