



WEB COPY



HCP.No.398 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 01.04.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

H.C.P.No.398 of 2025

Ranjith

... Petitioner/
Detenu

Vs.

1. The State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Salem City,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Linemedu, Salem - 636 006.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Salem,
Salem District.
4. The Inspector of Police,
NIB CID, Salem Unit,
Salem District.

... Respondents



HCP.No.398 of 2025

WEB COPY

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records relating to the Detention Order vide C.M.P.No.108/Drug Offender/Salem City/2024 dated 09.12.2024, passed by the second respondent and quash the same and direct the respondent herein to produce the petitioner/detenu namely Ranjith, S/o.Shanmuga Sundaram, aged 29 years, (who is presently under going detention in the Central Prison, Salem), before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Arun Kumar

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyaparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor
assisted by Mr.M.Sylvester John

- - - - -

ORDER

M.S.RAMESH, J.
AND
N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

The petitioner/detenu viz., Ranjith, S/o.Shanmuga Sundaram, aged about 29 years, confined at Central Prison, Salem, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 09.12.2024 branding him as "Drug Offender" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law



HCP.No.398 of 2025

WEB COPY


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, 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 an inordinate delay in passing the order of detention.

4. In the instant case, the detenue was arrested on 09.10.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 09.12.2024. 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



HCP.No.398 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 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.”



HCP.No.398 of 2025

WEB COPY 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.

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.



HCP.No.398 of 2025

WEB COPY

8. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 09.12.2024 in C.M.P.No.108/Drug Offender/Salem City/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Ranjith, aged 29 years, S/o. Shanmuga Sundaram, confined at Central Prison, Salem, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R, J.]

[N.S, J.]

01.04.2025

ASI

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Salem City,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Linemedu, Salem - 636 006.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Salem,
Salem District.



HCP.No.398 of 2025

WEB COPY

4. The Inspector of Police,
NIB CID, Salem Unit,
Salem District.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras, Chennai.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.398 of 2025

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

ASI

H.C.P.No.398 of 2025

01.04.2025