



WEB COPY



H.C.P. No.2355 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 14.10.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P. No.2355 of 2024

Rajendiran

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.State of Tamil Nadu represented
by Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Vellore District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Vellore District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
District Jail, Villupuram.
- 5.State rep. by Inspector of Police,
Ariyoor Police Station,
Vellore.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to
issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records of the second



H.C.P. No.2355 of 2024

respondent pertaining to the order made in Memo C3/D.O. No.73/2024, dated 04.08.2024 in detaining the detenu under the Tamil Nadu Act 14/1982 as a brand of Goonda and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu, the petitioner's son Rajesh, son of Rajendiran, aged 21 years who is detained at the District Jail, Villupuram, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Karthick

For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein is the father of the detenu viz., Rajesh, S/o. Rajendiran, aged 21 years, now confined at the District Jail, Villupuram, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent in Memo C3/D.O. No.73/2024, dated 04.08.2024.

2.Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.



H.C.P. No.2355 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 03.07.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 04.08.2024. 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



H.C.P. No.2355 of 2024

WEB COPY

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



H.C.P. No.2355 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 second respondent in Memo C3/D.O. No.73/2024, dated 04.08.2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Rajesh, S/o. Rajendiran, aged 21 years, now confined at the District Jail, Villupuram, 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.]

14.10.2024

Index: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

vga



WEB COPY



H.C.P. No.2355 of 2024

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

vga

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Vellore District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Vellore District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
District Jail, Villupuram.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Ariyoor Police Station,
Vellore.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.

H.C.P. No.2355 of 2024

14.10.2024