



HCP.No.2345 of 2024

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21.10.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.2345 of 2024

Usharani

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.State of Tamil Nadu represented by
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.

... Respondents



HCP.No.2345 of 2024

WEB COPY

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records of the 2nd Respondent pertaining to the order made in Memo C3/D.O.No.75/2024 dated 04.08.2024 in detaining the detainee under the Tamilnadu Act 14/1982 as a brand of Goonda and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detainee the petitioner's son Karthikeyan Son of Ganesan aged 25 years who is detained at the District Jail, Villupuram before this Honble court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Karthick Ramachandran

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

ORDER

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

The order of detention passed by the 2nd respondent in proceedings C3/D.O.No.75/2024 dated 04.08.2024 is sought to be quashed in the present Habeas Corpus Petition.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there is an inordinate delay in passing the order of detention.



HCP.No.2345 of 2024

WEB COPY

3. There is no adverse case against the detenu and based on the ground case alone the impugned order was passed. The ground case can be dealt with under the law of land. The ground stated in the impugned order would be insufficient to invoke Act 14 of 1982.

4. In the instant case, the detenu was arrested on 16.06.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 27.06.2024. 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



HCP.No.2345 of 2024

WEB COPY

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.



HCP.No.2345 of 2024

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 second respondent in C3/D.O.No.75/2024 dated 04.08.2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Mr.Karthikeyan S/o.Ganesan, aged about 25 years, who is detained at 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.]

21.10.2024

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

ep



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2345 of 2024

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

ep

To

- 1.State of Tamil Nadu represented by
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.2345 of 2024

21.10.2024