



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2465 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 09.02.2024

CORAM

**THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH
AND
THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN**

H.C.P.No.2465 of 2023

Suriya

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu,
rep. By the Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.

2.District Collector and District Magistrate
of Chengalpattu District, Office of the
District Collector and District Magistrate,
Chengalpattu, Chengalpattu District.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Chengalpattu, Chengalpattu District.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai 600 006..

5.The Inspector of Police,
Chengalpattu Town Police Station,
Chengalpattu District.

.. Respondents



HCP.No.2465 of 2023

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the detention order in CPT No.67/2023, dated 06.10.2023 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamilnadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenue Suriya, S/o. Muniyan aged about 31 years, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Suresh Lal

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner namely Suriya, S/o Muniyan, aged 31 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 06.10.2023 in CPT No.67/2023, slapped on him, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video



HCP.No.2465 of 2023

Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].

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 12.07.2023 and the detention order was passed on 06.10.2023. 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 passing the order of detention after the arrest of the detenu, the detention



HCP.No.2465 of 2023

order is liable to be quashed.

WEB COPY

6. Hence, for the aforesaid reason, the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 06.10.2023 in CPT No.67/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Suriya, S/o Muniyan, aged about 31 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.)
09.02.2024

NCC : Yes / No

Index : Yes / No

sr

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate
of Chengalpattu District, Office of the
District Collector and District Magistrate,
Chengalpattu, Chengalpattu District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Chengalpattu, Chengalpattu District.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2465 of 2023

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

SR

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai 600 006..

5.The Inspector of Police,
Chengalpattu Town Police Station,
Chengalpattu District.

6.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court, Chennai.

H.C.P.No.2465 of 2023

09.02.2024