



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2499 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 28.10.2024

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
AND
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

H.C.P.No.2499 of 2024

S.Loganathan .. Petitioner

v.

1. The Chief Secretary to Government of Puducherry
Union of Puducherry
Chief Secretariat, Puducherry
2. The Secretary to Lieutenant Governor
Rajnivas, Puducherry
3. The District Magistrate-cum-Authorised Officer
Office of the District Magistrate
1st Floor, Vazhadvavoor Road
Kavundanpalayam, Puducherry 605 009
4. The Superintendent of Police (East)
Puducherry
5. The Chief Superintendent of Jail
Central Prison, Kalapet
Puducherry



H.C.P.No.2499 of 2024

6. The Inspector of Police
Odiansalai Police Station
Puducherry

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the detention order in No.02/DM/RO/D2/PPASAA/2024 dated 21.08.2024 passed by the 3rd respondent under the Puducherry Prevention of Anti-Social Activities Act, 2008 (Act 10 of 2010) and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's son Karthi @ Karthikeyan S/o. Loganathan, aged about 27 years, the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Kalapet, Puducherry before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner :: Mr.U.Yuvaraj

For Respondents :: Mr.K.S.Mohandass
Public Prosecutor (Pondicherry)

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by S.M.SUBRAMANIAM,J.)

The petitioner herein, who is the father of the detenu, viz., Karthi @ Karthikeyan, S/o Loganathan, aged 27 years, now confined at Central Prison, Kalapet, Puducherry has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the third respondent in No.02/DM/RO/D2/PPASAA/2024 dated 21.08.2024.



H.C.P.No.2499 of 2024

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned

Public Prosecutor (Pondicherry) 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 30.05.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 21.08.2024. This fact is not disputed by the learned 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:-

WEB COPY

“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.***



H.C.P.No.2499 of 2024

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.

8. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the third respondent in No.02/DM/RO/D2/PPASAA/2024 dated 21.08.2024 is hereby set aside and the habeas corpus petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Karthi @ Karthikeyan, S/o Loganathan, aged 27 years, now confined at Central



H.C.P.No.2499 of 2024

Prison, Kalapet, Puducherry is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

Index : yes

(S.M.S.,J.)

(V.S.G.,J.)

Neutral citation : yes/no

28.10.2024

SS

To

1. The Chief Secretary to Government of Puducherry
Chief Secretariat, Puducherry
2. The Secretary to Lieutenant Governor
Rajnivas, Puducherry
3. The District Magistrate-cum-Authorised Officer
Office of the District Magistrate
1st Floor, Vazhadhavor Road
Kavundanpalayam, Puducherry 605 009
4. The Superintendent of Police (East)
Puducherry
5. The Chief Superintendent of Jail
Central Prison, Kalapet
Puducherry
6. The Inspector of Police
Odiansalai Police Station
Puducherry
7. The Public Prosecutor (Pondicherry)
High Court, Madras



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2499 of 2024

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM,J.

AND

V.SIVAGNANAM,J.

SS

H.C.P.No.2499 of 2024

28.10.2024