



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1992 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.1992 of 2024

Devadharshini

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Secretary to the Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George, Chennai – 9.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate, Tiruppur District,
Tiruppur.

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

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison-Coimbatore,
Coimbatore District.

5.State rep. By its the Inspector of Police,
Uthukuli Police Station,
Tiruppur 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 entire records relation to the petitioner husband detention under tamil nadu act 14 of 1982 vide detention order dated 25.06.2024 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein made



H.C.P.No.1992 of 2024

in proceedings memo Cr. MP. NO. 64/ GOONDA/ 2024, quash the same as illegal and consequently, direct the respondent to produce the petitioner's husband namely Sadhasivam, S/O. Ravikannam aged 22 years before this high court and set the petitioner's husband at liberty from detention, now the petitioner's husband detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore.

For Petitioner : Mr. W.Camyles Gandhi

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 Cr. MP. NO. 64/ GOONDA/ 2024, dated 25.06.2024 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.1992 of 2024

4. In the instant case, the detenu was arrested on 03.05.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 25.05.2024. 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 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



H.C.P.No.1992 of 2024

unreasonable and stands unexplained depends on the facts and circumstances of each case.”

WEB COPY

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 be quashed.



H.C.P.No.1992 of 2024

8. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent in

Cr.MP. NO. 64/ GOONDA/ 2024, dated 25.06.2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Sadhasivam, S/O. Ravikannam aged 22 years, who is 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.]

29.08.2024

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Case Citation: Yes/No

gd

To

- 1.The Secretary to the Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George, Chennai – 9.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate, Tiruppur District,
Tiruppur.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Tiruppur District, Tiruppur.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison-Coimbatore,
Coimbatore District.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Uthukuli Police Station,
Tiruppur District.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor, Madras High Court, Chennai - 104.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1992 of 2024

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

gd

H.C.P.No.1992 of 2024

29.08.2024