



HCP.No.365 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 26.03.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.365 of 2024

Appunraj @ Appu,

...Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The State of Tamilnadu
Rep. by its Secretary to Government
Home Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Avadi Commissionerate,
Avadi,
Chennai – 600 054.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prisons,
Central Prison Puzhal,
Chennai – 600 066.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
T-12, Poonamallee Police Station,
Poonamallee, Chennai – 600 056.

...Respondents



HCP.No.365 of 2024

Prayer: Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records of the second respondent herein in Detention Order No.180 /BCDFGISSSV/2023, dated: 14.07.2023 and setting aside the order of detention passed therein and setting the detainee, Appunraj (a) Appu, aged 34 years, and set at liberty now detained in Central Prison, Puzhal II, Chennai.

For Petitioner : M/s.B.Iyappan
For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor
assisted by
Mr.C.Aravind

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, namely Appunraj (a) Appu, aged 34 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 14.07.2023 slapped on the petitioner, branding him as "GOONDA" under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982.

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



HCP.No.365 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 26.05.2023 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 14.07.2023. 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 there is unreasonable delay between the date of the order of detention & actual arrest of the detenu and in the



HCP.No.365 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 '***2024 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.

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



HCP.No.365 of 2024

WEB COPY

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, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 14.07.2023 in No.180/BCDFGISSSV/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Appunraj @ Appu, S/o.Santhanakumar, aged about 34 years is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R., J] [S.M., J]
26.03.2024

Internet: Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
dk



WEB COPY



HCP.No.365 of 2024

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

dk

Copy to:-

- 1.The Secretary to Government
Home Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Avadi Commissionerate,
Avadi,
Chennai – 600 054.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prisons,
Central Prison Puzhal,
Chennai – 600 066.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
T-12, Poonamallee Police Station,
Poonamallee, Chennai – 600 056.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.365 of 2024

26.03.2024