



HCP(MD)No.620 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 18.08.2025

CORAM:

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

THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA

HABEAS CORPUS PETITION(MD)No.620 of 2025

Kowsalya

... Petitioner

vs.

1. The Additional Secretary to Government of India,
Department of Consumer Affairs,
Room No.270, Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi.

2.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Department of Co-operation Food and Consumer Protection,
Secretariat, Chennai – 9.

3. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thoothukudi District,
Thoothukud.,.

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

... Respondents

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 of the respondent No.3 in H.S(M).Confdl.No.43/2025, dated 03.05.2025 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu by name Manibharathi, Son of Manipandian, aged about 27 years, now detained in Palayamkottai Central Prison before this Court and set him at liberty



HCP(MD)No.620 of 2025

WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.R. Vinoth Bharathi
For respondent No.1 : Mr.V. Sasikumar
For Respondent Nos. 2 to 4 : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar
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., Manibharathi, Son of Manipandian, aged about 27 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in H.S(M).Confdl.No.43/2025, dated 03.05.2025 holding him to be a "Block Marketer", as contemplated under the prevention of Block Marketing and Maintenance or 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 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



HCP(MD)No.620 of 2025

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 26.05.2025. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, though the representation is dated 26.05.2025, the same was received by the Government on 28.05.2025 and the reply was sent to the detenu on 21.07.2025. There is a delay of 38 days in considering the petitioner's representation. The said delay of 38 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



HCP(MD)No.620 of 2025

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 26.05.2025, which was received by the Government on 28.05.2025 and the reply letter was sent to the detenu on 21.07.2025. As per the proforma submitted the by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, there is a delay of 38 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 38 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



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.620 of 2025

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 4 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.



HCP(MD)No.620 of 2025

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 H.S(M).Confdl.No.43/2025, dated 03.05.2025, passed by the third respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Manibharathi, Son of Manipandian, aged about 27 years, 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.]
18.08.2025

Index : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No
trp

To:

1. The Additional Secretary to Government of India,
Department of Consumer Affairs,
Room No.270, Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi.

2.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Department of Co-operation Food and Consumer Protection,
Secretariat, Chennai – 9.

3. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thoothukudi District,
Thoothukud,.



HCP(MD)No.620 of 2025

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

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



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.620 of 2025

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

trp

**ORDER MADE IN
HCP(MD)No. 620 of 2025**

DATED : 18.08.2025