



H.C.P.No.1056 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 23.07.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.1056 of 2024

Poornima

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by its Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St. George
Chennai – 600 009

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate
Coimbatore Collectorate
Coimbatore District

3.The Superintendent
Central Prison Coimbatore
Coimbatore

4.The Superintendent of Police
Coimbatore SP Office Building
Coimbatore District

5.The Inspector of Police



H.C.P.No.1056 of 2024

AWPS - Kovilpalayam Police Station
Coimbatore District
Crime No.113 of 2024

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records leading to the detention of the petitioner's husband namely Subramanian S/o.Kulanthai, M/A 43 years, vide detention order dated 02.04.2024, on the file of the 2nd respondent herein made in the proceedings in Cr.M.P.No.18/S.O./2024 and to quash the same and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the body and person of the Subramanian aged about 43 years, before this Court and thereafter set him at liberty from Central Prison, Coimbatore District.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Thamaraiselvan

For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the wife of the detenue viz. Thiru Subramanian, aged about 43 years, S/o.Kulanthai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 02.04.2024 slapped on her husband, branding him as "SEXUAL



H.C.P.No.1056 of 2024

WEB COPY
"OFFENDER" 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, 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 detenu was arrested on 22.02.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 02.04.2024. 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,



H.C.P.No.1056 of 2024

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 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**



H.C.P.No.1056 of 2024

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.

8. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent on 02.04.2024 in Cr.M.P.No.18/S.O./2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Thiru Subramanian, aged about 43 years, S/o.Kulanthai, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.



WEB COPY

kas



H.C.P.No.1056 of 2024

[M.S.R., J] [S.M., J]
23.07.2024

To.

1.The Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St. George
Chennai – 600 009

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate
Coimbatore Collectorate
Coimbatore District

3.The Superintendent
Central Prison Coimbatore
Coimbatore

4.The Superintendent of Police
Coimbatore SP Office Building
Coimbatore District

5.The Inspector of Police
AWPS - Kovilpalayam Police Station
Coimbatore District
Crime No.113 of 2024

6.The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras
Chennai 600 104



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1056 of 2024

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

kas

H.C.P.No.1056 of 2024

23.07.2024