



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.957 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 04.07.2024

CORAM :

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN**

H.C.P.No.957 of 2024

Naseena Sai

.. Petitioner/
Himself of the detinue
Versus

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government, Home,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.
 2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.
 3. The Superintendent, Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai - 66.
 4. The Inspector of Police,
M.1, Madhavaram Police Station,
Chennai.
- .. Respondents

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 entire records relating to the detention order passed by the second respondent pertaining to the order made in B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V. No.158/2024 dated 05.03.2024 in detain the detinue under 2(e) of Tamil



H.C.P.No.957 of 2024

Nadu Act 14 of 1982, as a DRUG OFFENDER and quash the same and direct the respondent to produce the detainee Naseena Sai, son of Ramaiya, aged about 26 years, who is detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Nirmal Krishnan

For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein is the detainee viz., Naseena Sai, S/o.Ramaiya, aged about 26 years, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 05.03.2024 slapped on him, branding him as "Drug Offender" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Sexual Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 [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.



H.C.P.No.957 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 detenue was arrested on 25.01.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 05.03.2024. 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 detenue. 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



H.C.P.No.957 of 2024

WEB COPY

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.

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



H.C.P.No.957 of 2024

WEB COPY

36 days in passing the detention order after the arrest of the detenue 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 detenue, the detention order in the present case, is liable to be quashed.

8. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 05.03.2024 in No.158/BCDFGISSSV/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenue viz., Naseena Sai, S/o.Ramaiya, aged about 26 years, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R., J]
04.07.2024

[S.M., J]

Index : yes/no
Speaking order/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation : yes/no
grs

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government, Home,



H.C.P.No.957 of 2024

WEB COPY

Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.
3. The Superintendent, Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai - 66.
4. The Inspector of Police,
M.1, Madhavaram Police Station,
Chennai.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.957 of 2024

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

grs

H.C.P.No.957 of 2024

04.07.2024