



H.C.P.No2823 of 2024

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 28.11.2024

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
AND
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN

H.C.P.No.2823 of 2024

Gunasekaran

.. Petitioner/
Detenue's Son

v.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. By its Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 9
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate of
Ranipet District,
Ranipet.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Special Prison for Women,
Coimbatore – 18
4. The Inspector of Police (PEW),
Arakkonam PEW,
Arakkonam

.. Respondents



H.C.P.No2823 of 2024

WEB COPY

Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records of the detention made in B.3/D.O.No.46/2024 dated 02.07.2024 the second respondent herein and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce my mother the detenue Shanthi, age 40 years, now confined in Special Prison for Women, Coimbatore, before this Court and set the detenue Shanthi at liberty.

For Petitioner :: Mr.S.N.Subramani

For Respondents :: Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
 Additional Public Prosecutor
 for R1 to R4

ORDER

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

The preventive detention order passed by the second respondent dated 02.07.2024 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.



H.C.P.No2823 of 2024

WEB COPY

3. Though several grounds are raised in the petition, 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 16.05.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 02.07.2024. This fact is not disputed by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor.

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



WEB COPY

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.”

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.



H.C.P.No2823 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 proceedings B3/D.O.No.46/2024 dated 02.07.2024 is hereby set aside and the habeas corpus petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Santhi W/o. Suresh, aged 40 years, now confined at Central Prison, Salem, 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
rka

(S.M.S.,J.) (M.J.R.,J.)
28.11.2024



H.C.P.No2823 of 2024

WEB COPY To

1. The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. By its Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 9
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate of
Ranipet District,
Ranipet.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Special Prison for Women,
Coimbatore – 18
4. The Inspector of Police (PEW),
Arakkonam PEW,
Arakkonam
5. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No2823 of 2024

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM,J.

AND

M.JOTHIRAMAN,J.

rka

H.C.P.No.2823 of 2024

28.11.2024