



WEB COPY

H.C.P.No.1376 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 22.08.2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

H.C.P.No.1376 of 2024

Madhu

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Secretary to Government,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise IX,
Secretariat, St. George Fort,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Krishnagiri.

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

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Salem.

5.The Inspector of Police,
Kallavi Police Station,
Krishnagiri District.

... Respondents



H.C.P.No.1376 of 2024

Prayer: Habeas Corpus Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records of the 2nd respondent in reference to (Detention Order in S.C.No.15 of 2024 dated 09.05.2024, setting aside the order of detention passed therein and directing the respondent to produce the detenu by namely Thiru.Naveenkumar, son of Thiru.Madhu, aged about 27 years before this Court, now detained in Central Prison at Salem.

For Petitioner : Mr.J.Pradeep

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 father of the detenu viz., Naveenkumar, S/o. Madhu, aged 27 years, now confined at Central Prison, Salem, has come forward with this Habeas Corpus Petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent in S.C.No.15 of 2024 dated 09.05.2024.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned



H.C.P.No.1376 of 2024

Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondents.

WEB COPY

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 20.03.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 09.05.2024. This fact is not disputed by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor.

5. In the case of ***Sushanta Kumar Banik vs. State of Tripura***¹, 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:

“20. It is manifestly clear from a conspectus of the above decisions of this Court, that the

¹ [2022 LiveLaw (SC) 813]



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1376 of 2024

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***², 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.

² [2023 SCC OnLine Mad 6332]



H.C.P.No.1376 of 2024

WEB COPY

7. In yet another case i.e., in *Nagaraj vs. State of Tamil Nadu*³, 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 in S.C.No.15 of 2024 dated 09.05.2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Naveenkumar, S/o. Madhu, aged 27 years, now confined at Central Prison, Salem, 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.]
22.08.2024

Jeni
Index : Yes
Speaking order
Neutral Citation : Yes

³ [(2018) 3 MWN (Cri) 428]



H.C.P.No.1376 of 2024

To
WEB COPY

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise IX,
Secretariat, St. George Fort,
Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Krishnagiri.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Krishnagiri District,
Krishnagiri.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Salem.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Kallavi Police Station,
Krishnagiri District.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1376 of 2024

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

Jeni

H.C.P.No.1376 of 2024

22.08.2024