



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1994 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 29.08.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.1994 of 2024

Dhamodharan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to the Government,
Home Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Avadi City,
Tiruvallur District.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Puzhal,
Chennai – 600 066.

4.The Inspector of Police (Law and Order),
E-1, Ponneri Police Station,
Tiruvallur District.

... Respondents

Prayer: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the 2nd Respondent dated 22.05.2024 in No.51/BCDFGISSSV/2024 against the petitioner's son Thiru.Ashok, male,



H.C.P.No.1994 of 2024

aged 37, son of Dhamodharan, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal Chennai and to set aside the same and consequently direct the Respondents to produce the detainee before the court and set him at Liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr. T.Shanmugaboopathi

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 No.51/BCDFGISSSV/2024, dated 22.05.2024 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 inordinate delay in passing the order of detention.



H.C.P.No.1994 of 2024

4. In the instant case, the detenu was arrested on 27.03.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 22.05.2024. Another ground on which the learned counsel for the petitioner prays for quashing is that the arrest intimation in Page No.26 of typed set of papers served on the petitioner is not translated. These facts are 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



H.C.P.No.1994 of 2024

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.

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



H.C.P.No.1994 of 2024

be quashed.

WEB COPY

8. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent in No.51/BCDFGISSSV/2024, dated 22.05.2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Ashok, male, aged 37, son of Dhamodharan, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal Chennai, 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.]

29.08.2024

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Case Citation: Yes/No

gd

To

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to the Government,
Home Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Avadi City,
Tiruvallur District.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1994 of 2024

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

gd

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Puzhal,
Chennai – 600 066.

4.The Inspector of Police (Law and Order),
E-1, Ponneri Police Station,
Tiruvallur District.

5.The Joint Secretary to Government
Public (Law and Order),
Fort ST.George, Chennai – 9.

6.The Public Prosecutor, Madras High Court, Chennai - 104.

H.C.P.No.1994 of 2024

29.08.2024