



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2297 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.09.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
AND
THE HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE A.D. MARIA CLETE

H.C.P.No.2297 of 2024

Baby

... Petitioner/Mother of the Detenu

Vs.

1. State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by the Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Namakkal District.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Namakkal District,
Namakkal.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Salem Central Prison,
Salem.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Prohibition Enforcement Wing,
Namakkal District.

... Respondents



HCP.No.2297 of 2024

Prayer: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the detention order in C.M.P.No.30/Drug Offender/2024 (M1) dated 04.07.2024 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamilnadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's son Dharaniraj S/o. Rajamanickam aged about 29 years, the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Salem before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner	: Mr.P.Dasarathan
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 04.07.2024 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.

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 18.05.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 04.07.2024. This fact is not disputed by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor.

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 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 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.



HCP.No.2297 of 2024

8. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent in proceedings C.M.P.No.30/Drug Offender/2024 (M1) dated 04.07.2024 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is **allowed**. The detenu viz., Dharaniraj, aged 29 years, s/o. Rajamanickam 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.] [A.D.M.C., J.]
27.09.2024

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
veda



HCP.No.2297 of 2024

WEB COPY

1. State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by the Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and Order) Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 9.
3. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Namakkal District.
4. The Superintendent of Police,
Namakkal District,
Namakkal.
5. The Superintendent of Prison,
Salem Central Prison,
Salem.
6. The Inspector of Police,
Prohibition Enforcement Wing,
Namakkal District.
7. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai - 104.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2297 of 2024

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
AND
DR.A.D.MARIA CLETE, J.

veda

HCP.No.2297 of 2024

27.09.2024