



HCP.No.2132 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 18.09.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
AND
THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE N.MALA

H.C.P.No.2132 of 2024

V.Rajesh

... Petitioner/Friend of
the Detenue

Vs.

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to the Government,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
(Goondas Section),
Vepery,
Chennai - 600 007.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Special Prison for Women,
Puzhal, Chennai - 600 066.
4. The State rep.by
The Inspector of Police,
R-6, Kumaran Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondents



HCP.No.2132 of 2024

PRAAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records connected with the order of the 2nd respondent herein, in Memo No.693/BCDFGISSSV/2023 dated 23.12.2023 passed against the petitioner's friend of the detenu namely Shahul Hameed, S/o. Petitioner's friend of the detenu namely Shahul Hameed, S/o. Habeeb Mohamed, aged about 50 years, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai - 600 066 and set aside the same and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the body and person of the detenu before this Court and set her at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Ms.R.Saritha
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 23.12.2023 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.



HCP.No.2132 of 2024

3. 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.

4. In the instant case, the detenu was arrested on 17.11.2023 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 23.12.2023. This fact is not disputed by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor. More-so, the detenu is in prison for more than 10 months.

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



HCP.No.2132 of 2024

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.

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



HCP.No.2132 of 2024

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 BCDFGISSSV No.693/2023 dated 23.12.2023 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is **allowed**. The detenu viz., Shahul Hameed, S/o. Habeeb Mohamed aged 50 years 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.M., J.]
18.09.2024

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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2132 of 2024

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

veda

H.C.P.No.2132 of 2024

18.09.2024