



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2568 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 02.02.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.2568 of 2023

Veeramani

... Petitioner / Mother of the detenue
Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu
Represented by its Secretary,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collectorate,
Ariyalur District.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Superintendent of Police,
Ariyalur District.

4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Trichy.

5.The Inspector of Police,
Ariyalur Police Station,
Ariyalur District.

... Respondents



HCP.No.2568 of 2023

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records of the detention order in Cr.M.P.No.07/2023, dated 01.07.2023 on the file of the second respondent herein, and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the body of the detenue, Suryaprakash, son of Kannaiyan, Hindu, aged about 26 years, who is now confined in Central Prison, Trichy, before this Court, and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Prakash

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 herein, who is the father of the detenu, Suryaprakash, son of Kannaiyan, aged about 26 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 01.07.2023 slapped on her son, branding 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].



HCP.No.2568 of 2023

WEB COPY

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as 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 25.05.2023 and the detention order was passed on 01.07.2023. In a similar case, where there was a delay in passing the detention order dated 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.”



HCP.No.2568 of 2023

WEB COURT

This Court, in the said order, drew inspiration from the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**Sushanta Kumar Banik Vs. 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 Vs. State of Tamil Nadu**',



HCP.No.2568 of 2023

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.

6. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 01.07.2023 in Cr.M.P.No.07/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Suryaprakash, son of Kannaiyan, aged about 26 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]
02.02.2024

Index: Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
Anu

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2568 of 2023

SUNDER MOHAN, J.

Anu

To

1. The Secretary,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collectorate,
Ariyalur District.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Superintendent of Police,
Ariyalur District.

4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Trichy.

5.The Inspector of Police,
Ariyalur Police Station,
Ariyalur District.

5.The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.

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

H.C.P.No.2568 of 2023