



IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT JABALPUR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA,
CHIEF JUSTICE

&

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VINAY SARAF
ON THE 26th OF NOVEMBER, 2025

WRIT PETITION No. 22459 of 2021

SAURABH JAGET

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Appearance:

Shri Naman Gupta, learned counsel for the petitioner.

Dr. S.S. Chouhan, learned Government Advocate for the respondent/State.

WITH

WRIT PETITION No. 22452 of 2021

MAJBOOT SINGH

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Appearance:

Shri Naman Gupta, learned counsel for the petitioner.

Dr. S.S. Chouhan, learned Government Advocate for the respondent/State.

WRIT PETITION No. 22455 of 2021

HARISHCHANDRA

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Appearance:

Shri Naman Gupta, learned counsel for the petitioner.

Dr. S.S. Chouhan, learned Government Advocate for the respondent/State.



WRIT PETITION No. 22461 of 2021

HARISHCHANDRA

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Appearance:

Shri Naman Gupta, learned counsel for the petitioner.

Dr. S.S. Chouhan, learned Government Advocate for the respondent/State.

ORDER

Per. Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjeev Sachdeva, Chief Justice

Learned counsel for petitioners submits that respondent No.3 in all the petitions are present.

Respondent No.3 in all the petitions are directed to mark their presence before the Registrar (J) as per rules.

Later on

Pursuant to our order passed in the morning, respondent no.3 in all the petitions had appeared before the Registrar (Judicial-II) who has noted their presence.

Respondent no.3, are also present in the Court.

Petitioners on behalf of respondent no.3 had impugned the validity of orders of detention passed by the Collector for detention of said respondent no.3, (detenu) under Section 3 of the Prevention of Black Marketing & Maintenance of Supplies of Essential Commodities Act, 1980. Though the original order did not mention any period amounted to a detention order for an indefinite period. Reference may be had to Section 13 of the Prevention of Black Marketing & Maintenance of Supplies of Essential Commodities Act, 1980 which reads as under:



"13. Maximum period of detention.—The maximum period for which any person may be detained in pursuance of any detention order which has been confirmed under section 12, shall be six months from the date of detention: Provided that nothing contained in this section shall affect the power of the appropriate Government to revoke or modify the detention order at any earlier time."

Section 13 mandates that the maximum period for detention pursuant to any detention order shall be six months from the date of detention. In the subject case, by order dated 29.10.2021, the detenues have been granted interim bail. The maximum period of detention under Section 13 would be six months and the said period has expired. Since the period has expired, the detention orders have lost its force. We are informed that there are no further orders passed for fresh detention under Section 3 against the respondent no.3. Since the orders of detention which were passed on 13.07.2021 have elapsed by efflux of time, the petitions have become infructuous as detenus have already been enlarged on bail. The bail bond and personal bond stand discharged.

In the above terms, the petitions are disposed of.

(SANJEEV SACHDEVA)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(VINAY SARAF)
JUDGE