



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2178 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 16.02.2024

CORAM :

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH**  
**AND**  
**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN**

H.C.P.No.2178 of 2023

R.Vinitha

... Petitioner

***Vs.***

1.The Government of Tamil Nadu,  
represented by its Secretary,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Secretariat, Puducherry.

2.The District Magistrate Cum Authorised Officer,  
Puducherry.

3.The Chief Superintendent,  
Central Prison, Kalapet,  
Puducherry.

4.The Superintendent of Police, (North),  
Puducherry.

5.The Inspector of Police,  
Mettupalyam Police Station, Puducherry.

... Respondents



HCP.No.2178 of 2023

**PRAYER:** Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to produce the body of the detenu namely, Thiru Rangarajan @ Puliyanakottai, aged 27 years, S/o.Ramalingam, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith, by calling for the records pertaining to the detention order in No.07/DM/RO/D2/PPASAA/2023, dated 11.10.2023 passed by the second respondent, quash the same as illegal, incompetent and ultravires.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.S.Tamilvendan  
For Respondents : Mr.K.S.Mohandas  
Public Prosecutor, Puducherry

### **ORDER**

**M.S.RAMESH, J.**  
**and**  
**SUNDER MOHAN, J.**

The petitioner herein, who is the wife of the detenu Rangarajan @ Puliyanakottai, aged 27 years, S/o.Ramalingam, detained at Central prison, Kalapet, Puducherry, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 11.10.2023 slapped on her husband, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu



HCP.No.2178 of 2023

Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Sexual Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].

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

3. Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there is a delay in passing the order of detention.

4. In the instant case, admittedly, the detenu was arrested on 21.07.2023 and the detention order was passed on 11.10.2023. In a similar case, where there was a delay in passing the detention order dated 18.06.2022 after the arrest of the detenu on 08.04.2022, this Court in HCP No.1388 of 2022 [*Gomathi Vs. Principal Secretary to Government and Others, reported in 2023 SCC OnLine Mad 6332*], held as follows:



HCP.No.2178 of 2023

WEB COPY

*“6.... As between 08.04.2022 and 18.06.2022, it is well over two months and given the facts and circumstances of the instant case, particularly ground and the adverse cases, we find that this live and proximate link between grounds and purpose of detention had in fact snapped.”*

This Court, in the said order, drew inspiration from the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**Sushanta Kumar Banik Vs. State of Tripura**', reported in '**2022 LiveLaw (SC) 813**', though in that case, the Hon'ble Supreme Court did not directly deal with the issue of delay in passing the detention order after the arrest of the detenu. The relevant observations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, are 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*



HCP.No.2178 of 2023

*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. In yet another case i.e., in '*Nagaraj Vs. State of Tamil Nadu*', reported in '*(2018) 3 MWN (Cri) 428*', this Court 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. Therefore, we are of the view that in view of the unexplained delay in passing the order of detention after the arrest of the detenu, the detention order is liable to be quashed.

6. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 11.10.2023 in No.07/DM/RO/D2/PPASAA/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Rangarajan @ Puliyanakottai, aged 27 years, S/o.Ramalingam, detained at Central prison, Kalapet, Puducherry, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith,



HCP.No.2178 of 2023

unless he is required in connection with any other case.

WEB COPY

[M.S.R., J] [S.M., J]  
16.02.2024

Index: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

*Anu*



HCP.No.2178 of 2023

WEB COPY

- To
- 1.The Secretary,  
Government of Tamil Nadu,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Secretariat, Puducherry.
  - 2.The District Magistrate Cum Authorised Officer,  
Puducherry.
  - 3.The Chief Superintendent,  
Central Prison, Kalapet,  
Puducherry.
  - 4.The Superintendent of Police, (North),  
Puducherry.
  - 5.The Inspector of Police,  
Mettupalyam Police Station, Puducherry.
  - 6.The Joint Secretary,  
Law and Order Department,  
Secretariat, Chennai.
  - 7.The Public Prosecutor,  
Puducherry.



WEB COPY



*HCP.No.2178 of 2023*

**M.S.RAMESH, J.**  
**and**  
**SUNDER MOHAN, J.**

*Anu*

H.C.P.No.2178 of 2023

16.02.2024