



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2655 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 05.11.2024

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
AND
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN

H.C.P.No.2655 of 2024

Nagammal
W/o Sathish Kumar .. Petitioner

v.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu
represented by Addl.Chief Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department
Fort St.George, Chennai 600 009
2. The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai Police
Vepery, Chennai 600 007
3. The Inspector of Police
D4 Zam Bazar Police Station
Zambazaar, Chennai
4. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal-II
Chennai 600 066 .. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying



H.C.P.No.2655 of 2024

for issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records relating to the detention order passed by the second respondent in BCDFGISSSV No.383/2024, order dated 17.04.2024 and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the body or person of the petitioner's brother namely Ranjith @ Ranjith Kumar, Male, aged 36 years, son of Poyyadhu before this Hon'ble High Court of Madras, where he is presently undergoing detention in the Central Prison, Puzhal-II, Chennai and he may be set at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner :: Mr.K.Vignesh

For Respondents :: Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner, who is the sister of the detenu, viz., Ranjith @ Ranjithkumar, S/o Poyyadhu, aged 36 years, now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent in proceedings BCDFGISSSV No.383/2024 dated 17.04.2024.

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



H.C.P.No.2655 of 2024

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 05.03.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 17.04.2024. 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



H.C.P.No.2655 of 2024

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.



H.C.P.No.2655 of 2024

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 proceedings BCDFGISSSV No.383/2024 dated 17.04.2024 is hereby set aside and the habeas corpus petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Ranjith @ Ranjithkumar, S/o Poyyadhu, aged 36 years, now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

Index : yes

Neutral citation : yes/no

(S.M.S.,J.)

(M.J.R.,J.)

05.11.2024

SS



H.C.P.No.2655 of 2024

To
WEB COPY

1. The Addl. Chief Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department
Fort St.George, Chennai 600 009
2. The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai Police
Vepery, Chennai 600 007
3. The Inspector of Police
D4 Zam Bazar Police Station
Zambazar, Chennai
4. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal-II
Chennai 600 066
5. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2655 of 2024

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM,J.

AND

M.JOTHIRAMAN,J.

SS

H.C.P.No.2655 of 2024

05.11.2024