



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.339 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 01.03.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.339 of 2024

Murugan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. State of Tamil Nadu
Represented by the Additional Chief Secretary
to Government,
Department of Home, Prohibition and Excise ,
Secretariat, Fort St. George, Chennai 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Coimbatore District.
3. The Superintendent of Police
Coimbatore District.
4. The Superintendent of Prisons,
Central Prison, Coimbatore.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Pollachi Taluk Police Station,
Coimbatore District

... Respondents



H.C.P.No.339 of 2024

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records pertaining to the order of detention passed by the second respondent in Cr.M.P.No.17/S.O./2023/E1 dated 17.05.2023 against the detenu Murugan, M/A-47 years, S/o. Mahali, now confined in Central Prison, Coimbatore, detaining him as Goonda, set aside the impugned order of detention order passed in Cr.M.P. No.17/S.O./2023/E1 dated 17.05.2023 under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and direct the respondents to produce the body of the detenu before this Hon'ble Court and set the detenu at liberty.

For petitioner : Mr. C.S.S. Pillai
For Respondents : Mr.A. Gokulakrishnan
Additional Public Prosecutor
Assisted by Aravind.C

ORDER

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
SUNDER MOHAN, J.

The petitioner, Murugan, aged 47 years, S/o. Makali, who is the detenu, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 17.05.2023, in Cr.M.P. No.17/S.O/2023/E1, slapped on him, branding him as "Sexual Offender" as contemplated under Section 2(ggg) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14/1982.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.



H.C.P.No.339 of 2024

3. Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there is an inordinate delay in passing the order of detention.

4. In the instant case, the detenu was arrested on 11.03.2023 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 17.05.2023. This fact is not disputed by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor.

5. In the case of '**Sushanta Kumar Banik Vs. State of Tripura**', reported in '**2022 LiveLaw (SC) 813**', when there was an inordinate delay from the date of proposal till passing of the detention order and likewise, between the date of detention order and the actual arrest, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had held that the live and proximate link, between the grounds and the purpose of detention, stands snapped in arresting the detenu. The relevant observation of the Hon'ble Supreme Court is extracted hereunder:-

“20. It is manifestly clear from a conspectus of the above decisions of this Court, that the underlying principle is that if



H.C.P.No.339 of 2024

WEB COPY

there is unreasonable delay between the date of the order of detention & actual arrest of the detenu and in the same manner from the date of the proposal and passing of the order of detention, such delay unless satisfactorily explained throws a considerable doubt on the genuineness of the requisite subjective satisfaction of the detaining authority in passing the detention order and consequently render the detention order bad and invalid because the “live and proximate link” between the grounds of detention and the purpose of detention is snapped in arresting the detenu. A question whether the delay is unreasonable and stands unexplained depends on the facts and circumstances of each case.”

6. Drawing inspiration from the judgment in ***Sushanta Kumar Banik's case***, a co-ordinate Bench of this Court in the case of '***Gomathi Vs. Principal Secretary to Government and Others***', reported in '***2023 SCC OnLine Mad 6332***', had held that when there is an inordinate delay from the date of arrest/date of proposal till the order of detention, the live and proximate link between them would also stand snapped and thereby, had quashed the detention order on this ground.



H.C.P.No.339 of 2024

WEB COPY

7. In yet another case i.e., in '*Nagaraj Vs. State of Tamil Nadu*', reported in '**(2018) 3 MWN (Cri) 428**', this Court had held that the delay of 36 days in passing the detention order after the arrest of the detenu would snap the live and proximate link between the grounds and purpose of detention. Hence, in view of the unexplained and inordinate delay in passing the order of detention, after the arrest of the detenu, the detention order in the present case, is liable to be quashed.

8. Accordingly, for the aforesaid reason, the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 17.05.2023, in Cr.M.P. No.17/S.O./2923/E1, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Murugan, aged 47 years, S/o. Makali, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless he is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R., J] [S.M., J]
01.03.2024

bga
Index : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No

5/7



H.C.P.No.339 of 2024

To
WEB COPY

1. The Additional Chief Secretary
to Government,
Department of Home, Prohibition and Excise ,
Secretariat, Fort St. George, Chennai 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Coimbatore District.
3. The Superintendent of Police
Coimbatore District.
4. The Superintendent of Prisons,
Central Prison, Coimbatore.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Pollachi Taluk Police Station,
Coimbatore District.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
7. The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.339 of 2024

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
SUNDER MOHAN, J.

bga

H.C.P.No.339 of 2024

01.03.2024