



WEB COPY

H.C.P.No.2176 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 03.10.2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

H.C.P.No.2176 of 2024

Nandagopal

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.Government of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tiruvannamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Tiruvannamalai District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Vellore.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Dusi Police Station,
Tiruvannamalai District
Crime No.317 of 2024.

...



H.C.P.No.2176 of 2024

Respondents

Prayer: Habeas Corpus Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records D.O.No.53/2024-C2 dated 14.08.2024, on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's son Thiru. Yathesh, aged 19 years S/o.Nandagopal, who is now confined in Central Prison, Vellore before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Silambuselvan

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.53/2024-C2 dated 14.08.2024.

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.2176 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 12.07.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 14.08.2024. This fact is not disputed by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor. However, the ground case can be dealt with by the Police Authorities by the law of the land. Thus, we are of the considered opinion that preventive detention need not be extended in the present case.

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

1. 2022 LiveLaw (SC) 813



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2176 of 2024

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***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

2. 2023 SCC OnLine Mad 6332

3. (2018) 3 MWN (Cri) 428



H.C.P.No.2176 of 2024

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 2nd respondent in D.O.No.53/2024-C2 dated 14.08.2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Yathesh, S/o. Nandagopal, aged 19 years, now confined at Central Prison, Vellore, 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.]
03.10.2024

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



H.C.P.No.2176 of 2024

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tiruvannamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Tiruvannamalai District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Vellore.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Dusi Police Station,
Tiruvannamalai District
Crime No.317 of 2024.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2176 of 2024

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

Jeni

H.C.P.No.2176 of 2024

03.10.2024