



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2179 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 31.01.2024

CORAM :

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH**

**AND**

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN**

H.C.P.No.2179 of 2023

Usha

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. State of Tamil Nadu represented  
By Secretary to Government  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department  
Fort St. George, Chennai 600 009.

2. The Commissioner of Police,  
Avadi City.

3. The Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison Puzhal, Chennai.

4. State represented by Inspector of Police  
Ambattur Police Station,  
Thiruvallur

... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to  
issue Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records of the 2nd respondent



H.C.P.No.2179 of 2023

pertaining to the order made in Memo No.209/BCDFGISSSV/2023, dated 27.09.2023 in detaining the detenu under the Tamil Nadu Act 14/1982 as a Goonda and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu, namely Surya, S/o.Sekar, aged 23 years who is detained at the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before the Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For petitioner : Mr.S. Karthick

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, mother of the detenu Surya, aged 23 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 27.09.2023, in No.209/BCDFGISSSV/2023, slapped on her son, branding him as "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



H.C.P.No.2179 of 2023

Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

WEB COPY

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 21.07.2023 and the detention order was passed on 27.09.2023. 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



H.C.P.No.2179 of 2023

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 passing the order of detention after the arrest of the detenu, the detention order is liable to be quashed.



H.C.P.No.2179 of 2023

6. Hence, for the aforesaid reason, the detention order passed by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent dated 27.09.2023, in No.209/BCDFGISSSV/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Surya, S/o.Sekar, aged about 23 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]**  
**31.01.2024**

bga

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

To

1. State of Tamil Nadu represented  
By Secretary to Government  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department  
Fort St. George, Chennai 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,  
Avadi City.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison Puzhal, Chennai.
4. State represented by Inspector of Police  
Ambattur Police Station, Thiruvallur.
5. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.
6. The Joint Secretary, Law and Order Department,  
Secretariat, Chennai.

5/6



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2179 of 2023

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

bga

H.C.P.No.2179 of 2023

**31.01.2024**