



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1450 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 14.08.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

H.C.P.No.1450 of 2024

M.Mareeswari

... Petitioner/mother of the detenue

Vs.

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Principal Secretary to Government,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and
The District Collector,
Karur District,
Karur.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Coimbatore.
- 4.The Superintendent of Police,
Karur District,
Karur.



HCPNo.1450 of 2024

5.The Inspector of Police,
Aravakurichi Circle,
Karur District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records pertaining to the proceedings of the 2nd respondent made in his proceedings in Detention Order in Cr.M.P.No.10/2024 dated 14.05.2024 and quash the same and set the petitioner's son by name "Dhanush, S/o.Ramajeyam aged about 21 years" at liberty from Central Prison Coimbatore/3rd respondent and thus render justice.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Jagadeesh Pandian

For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein is the son of the detenu viz., Dhanush, S/o.Ramajeyam aged about 21 years, now confined at Central Prison Coimbatore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent in Cr.M.P.No.10/2024 dated 14.05.2024



HCP.No.1450 of 2024

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 an inordinate delay in passing the order of detention.

4. In the instant case, the detenu was arrested on 27.02.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 14.05.2024. 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 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:-



HCP.No.1450 of 2024

WEB COPY

“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 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,



HCP.No.1450 of 2024

had quashed the detention order on this ground.

WEB COPY

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 second respondent in Cr.M.P.No.10/2024 dated 14.05.2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Dhanush, S/o.Ramajeyam aged about 21 years, now confined at Central Prison Coimbatore, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

[S.M.S., J.]

[V.S.G., J.]

14.08.2024



HCP.No.1450 of 2024

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
AND
V.SIVAGNANAM, J.

gd

To

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and
The District Collector,
Karur District,
Karur.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Coimbatore.
- 4.The Superintendent of Police,
Karur District,
Karur.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Aravakurichi Circle,
Karur District.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.

H.C.P.No.1450 of 2024



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1450 of 2024

14.08.2024
(2/2)