



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2062 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 19.01.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.2062 of 2023

Vinitha

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police
Detaining Authority,
Tiruppur City, Tiruppur District.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison - Coimbatore,
Coimbatore District.

4.State Rep. by its
The Inspector of Police,
South Police Station,
Tiruppur City,
Tiruppur District.

... Respondents



H.C.P.No.2062 of 2023

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records relating to the petitioner's husband detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14/1982 vide detention order dated 22.09.2023 on the file of the second respondent herein made in proceedings Memo C.No.59/G/IS/Tiruppur City/2023, quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's husband namely Thavam @ Muthuramalingam, S/o. Muthukrishnan, aged about 40 years before the Hon'ble Court and set the petitioner's husband at liberty from detention, now the petitioner's husband detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore.

For petitioner : Mr.W.Camyles Gandhi

For Respondents : Mr.E. Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor
Assisted by Aravind.C

ORDER

(Order of the Court was delivered by **M.S.RAMESH, J.**)

The petitioner, wife of the detenu Thavam alias Muthuramalingam, aged 40 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 22.09.2023, in C.No.59/G/IS/Tiruppur City/2023, slapped on her husband, branding him as



H.C.P.No.2062 of 2023

"Goonda" as contemplated under Section 2(f) of the Tamil Nadu Act

14/1982.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

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

4. In the instant case, admittedly, the detenu was arrested on 31.07.2023 and the detention order was passed on 22.09.2023. In a similar case, where there was a delay in passing the detention order on 18.06.2022 after the arrest of the detenu on 08.04.2022, this Court in HCP No.1388 of 2022 [*Gomathi Vs. Principal Secretary to Government and Others, reported in 2023 SCC OnLine Mad 6332*], held as follows:

“6.... As between 08.04.2022 and 18.06.2022, it is well over two months and given the facts and circumstances of the instant case, particularly ground and the adverse cases, we find that this live and proximate link between



grounds and purpose of detention had in fact snapped.”

This Court, in the said order, drew inspiration from the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Sushanta Kumar Banik v. State of Tripura, reported in 2022 LiveLaw (SC) 813***, though in that case, the Hon'ble Supreme Court did not directly deal with the issue of delay in passing the detention order after the arrest of the detenu. The relevant observations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court are 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 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.”

5. In yet another case i.e., in ***Nagaraj v. State of Tamil Nadu***, reported in **(2018) 3 MWN (Cri) 428**, this Court held that the delay of 36 days in passing the detention order after the arrest of the detenu would snap



H.C.P.No.2062 of 2023

the live and proximate link between the grounds and purpose of detention.

Therefore, we are of the view that in view of the unexplained delay in passing the order of detention after the arrest of the detenu, the detention order is liable to be quashed.

6. Hence, for the aforesaid reason, the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 22.09.2023, in C.No.59/G/IS/Tiruppur City/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Thavam alias Muthuramalingam, S/o.Muthukrishnan, aged about 40 years, 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]
19.01.2024

bga

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No



H.C.P.No.2062 of 2023

To

WEB COPY

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police
Detaining Authority,
Tiruppur City, Tiruppur District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison - Coimbatore,
Coimbatore District.
- 4.State Rep. by its
The Inspector of Police,
South Police Station,
Tiruppur City, Tiruppur District.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
6. The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2062 of 2023

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

bga

H.C.P.No.2062 of 2023

19.01.2024
(5/5)