



H.C.P.(MD) No.318 of 2025

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 11.06.2025

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA
and
THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA**

H.C.P.(MD) No. 318 of 2025

Revathi

... Petitioner

-VS-

- 1.The Additional Secretary,
Government of India,
Ministry of Consumer affairs,
Food and Public Distribution
(Department of Consumer affairs)
Room No.270 Krishi Bhavan,
New Delhi-100 001.
- 2.The Additional Chief Secretary,
Government of Tamilnadu,
Co-operation, Food and Consumer Protection Department,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009.
- 3.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thanjavur District,
Thanjavur.



H.C.P.(MD) No.318 of 2025

WEB COPY

4.The Inspector of Police,
CSCID,
Thanjavur District.

5.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Trichy.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a writ of habeas corpus to call for the records pertaining to the order of detention passed by the third respondent in his proceedings P.D.No.04/2025 dated 30.01.2025 and quash the same as illegal and produce the detenu, namely Manikandan, son of Ramamoorthi, aged about 40 years, now he is confined at Central Prison, Trichy before this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Lenin Kumar

For Respondents : Mr.P.Arun Jeyatram
Central Government Standing Counsel

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Manikandan, son of Ramamoorthi, aged about 40 years. The detenu has been detained by the second



H.C.P.(MD) No.318 of 2025

WEB COPY

respondent by his order in P.D.No.04/2025, dated 30.01.2025 holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. 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 08.03.2025. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, though the representation is dated 08.03.2025, the same was received by the Government on 11.03.2025 and the rejection letter was sent to the detenu on 15.05.2025. There is a delay of 42 days in considering the petitioner's representation. The said delay of 42 days in considering the representation remains unexplained and the same vitiates the impugned detention order. In support of his contention, learned



H.C.P.(MD) No.318 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 08.03.2025, which was received by the Government on 11.03.2025 and the rejection letter was sent to the detenu on 15.05.2025. As per the proforma submitted the by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, there is a delay of 42 days in considering the representation of the petitioner and we find that the said delay remains unexplained.



WEB COPY

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 42 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 considered is whether the delay caused has been properly explained by the authorities concerned. But, in the instant case, the inordinate delay of 42 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.318 of 2025

WEB COPY

11. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in P.D.No.04/2025, dated 30.01.2025, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Manikandan, aged about 40 years, son of Ramamoorthi, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[A.D.J.C., J.] [R.P., J.]

11.06.2025

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



H.C.P.(MD) No.318 of 2025

WEB COPY

To:

- 1.The Additional Secretary,
Government of India,
Ministry of Consumer affairs,
Food and Public Distribution
(Department of Consumer affairs)
Room No.270 Krishi Bhavan,
New Delhi-100 001.
- 2.The Additional Chief Secretary,
Government of Tamilnadu,
Co-operation, Food and Consumer Protection Department,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009.
- 3.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thanjavur District,
Thanjavur.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
CSCID,
Thanjavur District.
- 5.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Trichy.
- 6.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.318 of 2025

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.
AND
R.POORNIMA, J.

am

H.C.P.(MD) No.318 of 2025

11.06.2025