



H.C.P.No.2135 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 03.10.2024

WEB COPY

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

H.C.P.No.2135 of 2024

Karthiga

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The Secretary to the Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.District Collector and District Magistrate of
Tiruvannamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Tiruvannamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Special Prison for Women,
Vellore-2.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Tiruvannamalai Town Police Station,
Tiruvannamalai District.

... Respondents



H.C.P.No.2135 of 2024

Prayer: Habeas Corpus Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the entire records in connection with the order of detention passed by the 2nd respondent dated 09.08.2024 in D.O.No.50/2024-C2 against the petitioner mother Muniyammal, Female aged 32 years W/o. Subramani, who is confined at Special Prison for Women, Vellore and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenue before the Court and set her at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Raman

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

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by **S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.**]

The present habeas corpus petition filed challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent in D.O.No.50/2024-C2 dated 09.08.2024.

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

3. Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned



H.C.P.No.2135 of 2024

counsel for the petitioner submitted that there is an inordinate delay in passing the order of detention.

4. In the instant case, the detenu was arrested on 16.06.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 09.08.2024. This fact is not disputed by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor.

5. In the case of *Sushanta Kumar Banik vs. State of Tripura*¹, 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

1. 2022 LiveLaw (SC) 813



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2135 of 2024

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***², 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***³, 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

2. 2023 SCC OnLine Mad 6332

3. (2018) 3 MWN (Cri) 428



H.C.P.No.2135 of 2024

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

8. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent in
D.O.No.50/2024-C2 dated 09.08.2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas
Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenue viz., Muniyammal, W/o. Subramani,
aged 32 years, now confined at Special Prison for Women, Vellore, 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.]
03.10.2024

Jeni
Index : Yes
Neutral Citation : Yes
Speaking order / Non-speaking order



H.C.P.No.2135 of 2024

To

WEB COPY

- 1.The Secretary to the Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.District Collector and District Magistrate of
Tiruvannamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Tiruvannamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Special Prison for Women,
Vellore-2.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Tiruvannamalai Town Police Station,
Tiruvannamalai District.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2135 of 2024

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

Jeni

H.C.P.No.2135 of 2024

03.10.2024