



HCP.No.2184 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 20.09.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.2184 of 2024

E.Sakthivel

... Petitioner/mother of the detenue
Vs.

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Detaining Authority,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Coimbatore.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Coimbatore,
Coimbatore District.

4.The Superintendent of Police,
Coimbatore District,
Coimbatore.

5.The Inspector of Police,
B-5, Vadavalli Police Station,
Coimbatore Town,
Coimbatore.

... Respondents



HCP.No.2184 of 2024

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records of the Respondents, particularly in connection with the order of detention passed by the 2nd respondent dated 12.03.2024, vide C.NO.22/G/IS/2024 against the Petitioner, Sakthivel S/o. Elango, Hindu, aged about 31 years, now confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore and set aside the same and direct the Respondents to produce the petitioner before this Court and set the petitioner at Liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Thanjan

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

ORDER

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

The order of detention passed by the 2nd respondent in proceedings C.NO.22/G/IS/2024 dated 12.03.2024 is sought to be quashed in the present Habeas Corpus Petition.

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



HCP.No.2184 of 2024


inordinate delay in passing the order of detention.

WEB COPY

4. In the instant case, the detenu was arrested on 10.02.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 12.03.2024. 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 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



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.2184 of 2024

WEB COPY

8. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent in C.NO.22/G/IS/2024 dated 12.03.2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Sakthivel S/o. Elango, Hindu, aged about 31 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.]

[N.S., J.]

20.09.2024

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

gd



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2184 of 2024

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

gd

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Detaining Authority,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Coimbatore.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Coimbatore,
Coimbatore District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Police,
Coimbatore District,
Coimbatore.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
B-5, Vadavalli Police Station,
Coimbatore Town,
Coimbatore.
- 5.The Joint Secretary to Government
Public (Law and Order),
Fort ST.George, Chennai – 9.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.

H.C.P.No.2184 of 2024
20.09.2024