



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2401 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 15.10.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.2401 of 2024

Mohan

... Petitioner

Vs.

State Rep.By

1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Government of Tamil Nadu,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police
Avadi, Commissionerate.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison-II,
Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.

4.The Inspector of Police (L&O),
T-3, Korattur Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records pertaining to the order of detention dated on 14.08.2024 passed by the 2nd respondent in No.128/BCDFGISSSV/2024 and quash the same as illegal and direct the



HCP.No.2401 of 2024

respondent to produce the detenu Thiru.Yuvaraj @ Appu S/o. Mohan, male aged about 23 yrs, now confined at Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Senthil Kumar

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 Memo No.128/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 14.08.2024 is sought to be quashed in the present Habeas Corpus Petition.

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

3. 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 08.06.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 14.08.2024. This fact is not



HCP.No.2401 of 2024

disputed by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor.

WEB COPY

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 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.”



HCP.No.2401 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 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 No.128/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 14.08.2024, is hereby set aside and the



HCP.No.2401 of 2024

Habeas Corpus Petition is **allowed**. The detenu viz., Yuvaraj @ Appu, male, aged about 23 years son of Mohan, who is 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.

[S.M.S., J.]

[V.S.G.,

J.]

15.10.2024

Index: Yes

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Speaking order/Non-speaking order

Jer

To

1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Government of Tamil Nadu,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police
Avadi, Commissionerate.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison-II,
Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.

4.The Inspector of Police (L&O),
T-3, Korattur Police Station,
Chennai.

5.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2401 of 2024

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

Jer

H.C.P.No.2401 of 2024

15.10.2024