



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1589 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.1589 of 2024

Iswarya

... Petitioner/wife of the detenue

Vs.

- 1 The State Of Tamil Nadu Rep. by its
The Principal Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition And Excise Department
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2 The District Magistrate And
District Collector,
Office Of The District Magistrate And District Collector
Karur District
Karur.
- 3 The Superintendent Of Police
Karur District.
- 4 The Superintendent Of Police,
The Central Prison,
Coimbatore,
Coimbatore District.



HCP.No.1589 of 2024

5 The Inspector Of Police
Aravakurichi Police Station,
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 relating to Detention order in Cr.M.P.No.08/2024 dated 10.05.2024, passed by the 2nd respondent herein and set aside the same as illegal and direct the respondents herein to produce my husband namely Vinoth Kannan, son of Sethuraman aged about 26 years, (who is presently under going detention in the Central Prison Coimbatore) before this Court and set him at Liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.Karuppusamy Pandiyan

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., Vinoth Kannan, son of Sethuraman, aged about 26 years, who is presently under going detention in the Central Prison, Coimbatore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent in Cr.M.P.No.08/2024 dated 10.05.2024.



HCP.No.1589 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. 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 26.02.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 10.05.2024. 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:-

“20. It is manifestly clear from a conspectus of the



HCP.No.1589 of 2024

WEB COPY

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, had quashed the detention order on this ground.



HCP.No.1589 of 2024

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.08/2024 dated 10.05.2024., is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Vinoth Kannan, son of Sethuraman, aged about 26 years, who is presently under going detention in the 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

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

gd



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1589 of 2024

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

gd

To

- 1 The State Of Tamil Nadu Rep. by its
The Principal Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition And Excise Department
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2 The District Magistrate And
District Collector,
Office Of The District Magistrate And District Collector
Karur District
Karur.
- 3 The Superintendent Of Police
Karur District.
- 4 The Superintendent Of Police,
The Central Prison,
Coimbatore,
Coimbatore District.
- 5 The Inspector Of Police
Aravakurichi Police Station,
Karur District.
- 6 The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.

H.C.P.No.1589 of 2024

14.08.2024