



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2365 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 13.03.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.2365 of 2023

Devi

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. State of Tamil Nadu
Represented by its Additional Chief Secretary
to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St. George, Chennai 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai Police Commissioner
The Commissioner Office,
Vepery, Chennai 7.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai 66.
4. The Inspector of Police,
D-3 Ice House Police Station,
Chennai

... Respondents

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



H.C.P.No.2365 of 2023

detention order in Memo No.549/BCDFISSSV/2023 dated 07.11.2023 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's son Dinesh @ Vendakkai Dinesh, aged about 23 years, S/o. Ramu the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner, mother of the detenu namely Dinesh @ Vendakkai Dinesh, aged 23 years, S/o.Ramu, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 07.11.2023, in No.549/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, as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

2/7



H.C.P.No.2365 of 2023

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 detenu was arrested on 01.10.2023 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 07.11.2023. 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 detenu. 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.2365 of 2023

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.



H.C.P.No.2365 of 2023

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 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. Hence, in view of the unexplained and inordinate delay in passing the order of detention, after the arrest of the detenu, the detention order in the present case, is liable to be quashed.

8. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 07.11.2023, in No.549/BCDFGISSSV/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenue viz., Dinesh @ Vendakkai Dinesh, aged 23 years, S/o. Ramu, 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]
13.03.2024

bga

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No



H.C.P.No.2365 of 2023

To

1. State of Tamil Nadu
Represented by its Additional Chief Secretary
to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St. George, Chennai 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai Police Commissioner
The Commissioner Office,
Vepery, Chennai 7.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai 66.
4. The Inspector of Police,
D-3 Ice House Police Station,
Chennai
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
6. The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2365 of 2023

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

bga

H.C.P.No.2365 of 2023

13.03.2024