



H.C.P.No.2060 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 22.01.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.2060 of 2023

Nagaraj

... Petitioner/Father of Detenu

Vs.

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition @ 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

Page 1 of 7



H.C.P.No.2060 of 2023

Prayer : Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the entire records relating to the petitioner's son detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order dated 22.09.2023 on the file of the second respondent herein made in proceedings Memo C.No.58/G/IS/Tiruppur City/2023 quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's son namely Alagarsamy, S/o.Nagaraj, aged about 35 years before this Court and set the petitioner's son at liberty from detention now the petitioner's son detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore.

For Petitioner : Mr.W.Camyles Gandhi

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner, father of the detenu, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 22.09.2023 slapped on his son, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982.



H.C.P.No.2060 of 2023

WEB COPY

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 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



H.C.P.No.2060 of 2023

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 Memo C.No.58/G/IS/Tiruppur City/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Alagarsamy, aged 35 years, S/o.Nagaraj, 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]
22.01.2024

ars

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition @ 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,

Page 5 of 7



H.C.P.No.2060 of 2023

Coimbatore District.

4. The Inspector of Police,
SOUTH Police Station,
Tiruppur City, Tiruppur District.

5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2060 of 2023

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

ars

H.C.P.No.2060 of 2023

22.01.2024