



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2460 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 30.10.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

H.C.P.No.2460 of 2024

K.Durgadevi

... Petitioner/Mother of the
Detenu

Vs.

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, Vazhadhavoor Road,
Kavundanpalayam,
Puducherry - 605 009.
4. The Superintendent of Police, (East),
Puducherry.



HCP.No.2460 of 2024

WEB COPY

5. The Chief Superintendent of Jail,
Central Prison, Kalapet,
Puducherry.

6. The Inspector of Police,
Odiansalai Police Station,
Puducherry.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the detention order in No.03/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 respondent to Produce the Petitioners son SRIKANTH S/O.KAMALAKARAN AGED ABOUT 19 YEARS, the detinue, now confined in Central Prison, Kalapet, Puducherry before this Court and set him at Liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.U.Yuvaraj

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

ORDER

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

The preventive detention order passed by the third respondent dated 21.08.2024 is sought to be quashed in the present habeas corpus petition.



HCP.No.2460 of 2024

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned 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 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 (Puducherry).

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



HCP.No.2460 of 2024

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. 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



HCP.No.2460 of 2024

quashed the detention order on this ground.

WEB COPY

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, No.03/DM/RO/D2/PPASAA/2024 dated 21.08.2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is **allowed**. The detenu viz., Srikanth, aged 19 years, S/o. Kamalakaran confined at Central Prison, Kalapet, Puducherry is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless he is required in connection with any other case.

[S.M.S., J.] [V.S.G., J.]
30.10.2024

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



HCP.No.2460 of 2024

To

WEB COPY

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, Vazhadhavoor Road,
Kavundanpalayam,
Puducherry - 605 009.
4. The Superintendent of Police, (East),
Puducherry.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2460 of 2024

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

veda

H.C.P.No.2460 of 2024

30.10.2024
(2/2)