



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2361 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 23.01.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.2361 of 2023

Saklen

S/o.Mazloom Hussain

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,

Represented by the Additional Chief Secretary, Home,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,

Greater Chennai,
Vepery, Chennai – 600 007.

3.The Inspector of Police,

S-7, Madipakkam Police Station,
Chennai.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,

Central Prison -II,
Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.

... Respondents



H.C.P.No.2361 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, calling for the records relating to the detention order in Memo No.404/BCDFGISSSV/2023 dated 19.09.2023 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondent to produce the petitioner Thiru.Saklen, S/o.Mazloom Hussain, aged about 23 years, the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set the petitioner Thiru.Saklen, S/o.Mazloom Hussain, aged about 23 years, the detenu herein at liberty.

For Petitioner	:	Mr.R.Muthu Kumar
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/detenu, Saklen, S/o.Mazloom Hussain, aged about 23 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 19.09.2023 slapped on him, branding



H.C.P.No.2361 of 2023

him as "Goonda" 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 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 04.08.2023 and the detention order was passed on 19.09.2023. 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:



H.C.P.No.2361 of 2023

WEB COPY

“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



H.C.P.No.2361 of 2023

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.

6. Hence, for the aforesaid reason, the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 19.09.2023 in BCDFGISSSV No.404/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Saklen, 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]
23.01.2024

pvs

Internet : Yes

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No



H.C.P.No.2361 of 2023

WEB COPY

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary, Home,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Vepery, Chennai – 600 007.
3. The Inspector of Police,
S-7, Madipakkam Police Station,
Chennai.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison -II,
Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2361 of 2023

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

pvs

H.C.P.No.2361 of 2023

23.01.2024