



HCP.No.1608 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 28.08.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

H.C.P.No.1608 of 2024

Rani

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,
Fort St. George, Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Veperty - 600 007.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Special Prison of Women, Puzhal,
Chennai - 600 066.
4. The Inspector of Police,
V-1, Villivakkam Police Station,
Chennai District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records in Detention order in Memo No.725/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 27.06.2024 on the file of the



HCP.No.1608 of 2024

second respondent and set aside the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the body of the detenu/daughter of the Petitioner Mrs.Chithra W/o. Murugesan aged about 46 years now confined under third respondent prison, before this Court and set at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Mohamed Saifulla
For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The preventive detention order passed by the second respondent dated 27.06.2024 is sought to be quashed in the present habeas corpus petition.

2. The learned Counsel for the petitioner would submit that there is a delay in passing the impugned order of detention.

3. In the present case, the detenu was arrested on 20.05.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 27.06.2024. This fact is not disputed by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor. Further, there is no adverse case relied on. Based on the ground case alone Act 14 of 1982



HCP.No.1608 of 2024

has been invoked. The ground case would be insufficient to form an opinion that there is likelihood of causing breach of public order. Thus, we are inclined to interfere.

4. 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



HCP.No.1608 of 2024

WEB COPY

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.”

5. 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.

6. 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



HCP.No.1608 of 2024

passing the order of detention, after the arrest of the detenu, the detention order in the present case, is liable to be quashed.

7. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent in Memo No.725/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 27.06.2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is **allowed**. The detenu viz., Chithra W/o. Murugesan, aged 46 years confined at Special Prison for Women, Puzhal, Chennai is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless her confinement is required in connection with any other case.

[S.M.S., J.]

[V.S.G., J.]

28.08.2024

Index : Yes/No
Speaking Order : Yes/No
Neutral Citation : Yes/No
veda



HCP.No.1608 of 2024

To

WEB COPY

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,
Fort St. George, Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Veparty - 600 007.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Special Prison of Women, Puzhal,
Chennai - 600 066.
4. The Inspector of Police,
V-1, Villivakkam Police Station,
Chennai District.
5. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and Order) Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 9.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai - 104.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1608 of 2024

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

veda

H.C.P.No.1608 of 2024

28.08.2024