



HCP.No.2289 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 19.10.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

H.C.P.No.2289 of 2024

Krishnakumar

... Petitioner/Detenu

Vs.

1. The State of Tamilnadu,
Represented by its Additional Chief Secretary
to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Avadi City.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai.
4. The Inspector of Police (L & O),
T-12, Poonamallee Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondents



HCP.No.2289 of 2024

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records of the detention made in D.O.No.83/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 25.06.2024, the second respondent herein and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu Krishna Kumar, aged 34 years, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set the detenu Krishna Kumar at liberty.

For Petitioner	: Mr.S.N.Subramani
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 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.



HCP.No.2289 of 2024

3. In the instant case, the detenu was arrested on 23.05.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 25.06.2024. This fact is not disputed by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor.

4. 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



HCP.No.2289 of 2024

WEB COPY

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.”

5. 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.

6. 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



HCP.No.2289 of 2024

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.

7. Further, the learned Counsel for the petitioner would submit that there is a delay of six (06) days in considering the representation.

8. The delay in considering the representation undoubtedly caused infringement of the right of personal liberty of the detenu under Article 21 of the constitution of India. Thus, the order of detention do not stand under the scrutiny of law.

9. It is also brought to the notice of this Court that the Special Report filed by the Sponsoring Authority is also undated. The special report is a relevant document for the purpose of passing an order of detention. Therefore, undated report caused prejudice to the detenu for making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2289 of 2024



HCP.No.2289 of 2024

10. For the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent in proceedings No.83/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 25.06.2024 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is **allowed**. The detenu viz., Krishnakumar, aged 34 years, S/o. Rajendiran 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.] [V.S.G., J.]
19.10.2024

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



HCP.No.2289 of 2024

WEB COPY

1. The Additional Chief Secretary
to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.
2. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and Order) Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 9.
3. The Commissioner of Police,
Avadi City.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai.
5. The Inspector of Police (L & O),
T-12, Poonamallee Police Station,
Chennai.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai - 104.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2289 of 2024

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

veda

H.C.P.No.2289 of 2024

19.10.2024