



HCP.No.2651 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 08.11.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN

H.C.P.No.2651 of 2024


Kalaiyarasi


... Petitioner/Wife of the
detenue

Vs.

1. The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
2. District Collector and District Magistrate of
Vellore District, Vellore.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Vellore District, Vellore.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Salem.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Thiuvallam Police Station,
Vellore District.

... Respondents





3. Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned

4. In the instant case, the detenu was arrested on 03.07.2024 and

5. In the case of '*Sushanta Kumar Banik Vs. State of Tripura*',

“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



HCP.No.2651 of 2024

WEB COPY

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.2651 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 2nd respondent, in proceedings No.C3/D.O.No.83/2024 dated 23.08.2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is **allowed**. The detenu viz., Suriya, aged 27 years, S/o. Subramani confined at Central Prison, Salem is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless he is required in connection with any other case.

[S.M.S., J.] [M.J.R., J.]
08.11.2024

Index : Yes/No
Speaking Order : Yes/No
Neutral Citation : Yes/No
veda



HCP.No.2651 of 2024

To

WEB COPY

1. The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
2. District Collector and District Magistrate of
Vellore District, Vellore.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Vellore District, Vellore.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Salem.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Thiuvallam Police Station,
Vellore District.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai - 104.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2651 of 2024

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

veda

H.C.P.No.2651 of 2024

08.11.2024