



HCP.No.2733 of 2024

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 18.11.2024

CORAM :

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM**  
**AND**  
**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN**

H.C.P.No.2733 of 2024

Umamageswari. L

... Petitioner

*Vs.*

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.

2. The Commissioner of Police, (Greater Chennai)  
No.132, Commissioner Office Building  
EVK Sampath Road, Vepery  
Chennai – Tamil Nadu – 600007.

3. The Inspector of Police,  
H6 Dr.R.K.Nagar Police Station,  
Chennai – 600 021.

4. The Superintendent of Prison  
Puzhal – II, Chennai – 600066.

... Respondents

**PRAYER:** Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to  
issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records relating to the  
detention dated 31.08.2024 in vide Memo No.903/BCDFGISSSV/2024



HCP.No.2733 of 2024

passed by the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent herein and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to set forth the detenue Ajithkumar @ Karuvadu aged 26 years now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal-II, Chennai before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Prasana 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 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent in proceedings in Memo No.903/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 31.08.2024 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 24.07.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 31.08.2024. This fact



HCP.No.2733 of 2024

is not 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*



HCP.No.2733 of 2024

WEB COPY

*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 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



HCP.No.2733 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 No.903/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 31.08.2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Ajithkumar @ Karuvadu Male aged 26 years S/o.Raj 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.]

[M.J.R., J.]

**18.11.2024**

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

tsh

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.

2. The Commissioner of Police, (Greater Chennai)



*HCP.No.2733 of 2024*

No.132, Commissioner Office Building  
EVK Sampath Road, Vepery  
Chennai – Tamil Nadu – 600007.

3. The Inspector of Police,  
H6 Dr.R.K.Nagar Police Station,  
Chennai – 600 021.

4. The Superintendent of Prison  
Puzhal – II, Chennai – 600066.

5.The Public Prosecutor,  
Madras High Court.



WEB COPY



*HCP.No.2733 of 2024*

**S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.**  
**AND**  
**M.JOTHIRAMAN, J.**

*tsh*

H.C.P.No.2733 of 2024



WEB COPY



*HCP.No.2733 of 2024*

18.11.2024