



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2039 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 06.09.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

and

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

H.C.P.No.2039 of 2024

Ramesh

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai -600 009.
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Namakkal District, Namakkal.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Namakkal District.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison -Salem,
Salem District.
5. The State rep. by its
The Inspector of Police,
PEW _ Tiruchengode,
Namakkal District.

... Respondents



HCP.No.2039 of 2024

PRAYER: The Habeas Corpus Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the entire records, relating to petitioner sister's son detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order, dated 26.07.2024 on the file of the second respondent herein made in proceedings Memo C.M.P.No.42/BOOTLEGGGER/2024 [M1], quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner sister's son namely Ravi @ Ravichandran S/o.Subramanian, aged 41 years, detained at Central Prison, Salem, before this Court and set him at liberty

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Sasikumar
For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor

- - - - -

ORDER

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

Solitary criminal case registered against the detenue is the basis for the issuance of the detention order.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.



HCP.No.2039 of 2024

WEB COPY

3. The detenue was arrested on 02.04.2024 and the impugned detention order has been passed on 26.07.2024. Based on the ground case, the petitioner is detained under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and there is no adverse case against the petitioner.

4. Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there is an inordinate delay in passing the order of detention.

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:-



HCP.No.2039 of 2024

WEB COPY

“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 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.2039 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 proceedings Memo C.M.P.No.42/BOOTLEGGGER/2024 [M1], dated 26.07.2024 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is **allowed**. The detenu viz., Ravi @ Ravichandran, S/o. Subramanian, aged 41 years, confined at Central Prison, Salem, 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.]
06.09.2024

asi

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2039 of 2024

and
V.SIVAGNANAM, J.

asi

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai -600 009.
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Namakkal District, Namakkal.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Namakkal District.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison -Salem,
Salem District.
5. The State rep. by its
The Inspector of Police,
PEW - Tiruchengode,
Namakkal District.

H.C.P.No.2039 of 2024

06.09.2024