



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2488 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 25.10.2024

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
AND
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

H.C.P.No.2488 of 2024

Vijaya
W/o Vasiappan .. Petitioner

v.

1. State of Tamil Nadu
rep by the Additional Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St.George, Chennai 600 009

2. The Commissioner of Police
Avadi City
Office of the Commissioner of Police
Avadi, Chennai 600 054

3. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai 600 066

4. The Inspector of Police
Cyber Crime Wing, Avadi City .. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying
for issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to



H.C.P.No.2488 of 2024

the detention order in No.110/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 29.07.2024 against the petitioner's son Mohanraj, S/o Vasiappan, Male, aged 34 years, the detenu herein, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai and produce and physically bring the body of the detenu before this Hon'ble Court and to set aside the detention order and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner :: Mr.T.I.Ramanathan

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the mother of the detenu, viz., Mohanraj, S/o Vasiappan, aged 34 years, now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent in No.110/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 29.07.2024.

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

3. No doubt, the detaining authority relied on two adverse cases



H.C.P.No.2488 of 2024

registered in Crime Nos.147 of 2024 and 167 of 2024 relating to Section 420 IPC and Section 66(D) of Information Technology (Amendment) Act.

The ground case is also registered for similar offence. However, we find that the detenu had been arrested on 29.05.2024 and the impugned detention order was issued on 29.07.2024. Thus there is enormous delay in issuing the detention order. Moreover, the detenu has already suffered preventive detention for about five months.

4. 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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2488 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.”

5. 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.2488 of 2024

6. 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.

7. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent in No.110/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 29.07.2024 is hereby set aside and the habeas corpus petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Mohanraj, S/o Vasiappan, aged 34 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.)

(V.S.G.,J.)

25.10.2024

SS



H.C.P.No.2488 of 2024

To

WEB COPY

1. The Additional Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St.George, Chennai 600 009
2. The Commissioner of Police
Avadi City
Office of the Commissioner of Police
Avadi, Chennai 600 054
3. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai 600 066
4. The Inspector of Police
Cyber Crime Wing, Avadi City
5. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2488 of 2024

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM,J.

AND

V.SIVAGNANAM,J.

SS

H.C.P.No.2488 of 2024

25.10.2024