



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.3129 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 19.12.2024

CORAM:

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

H.C.P.No.3129 of 2024

S.Suresh @ John Suresh

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Principal Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat Complex,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Office of Commissioner of Police,
Avadi – 600 054.

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

4.The Inspector of Police, L&O
T-10 Thirumullaivoyal Police Station,
Chennai District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the
Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for



H.C.P.No.3129 of 2024

the records relating to the detention order in No.175/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 15.10.2024 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce Kavi @ Kaviyarasu, S/o.John Suresh, aged about 38 years, who is presently confined in the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Santhosh

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The order of detention passed by the second respondent in proceedings No.175/BCDFGISSSV/2024, dated 15.10.2024 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



H.C.P.No.3129 of 2024

WEB COPY

inordinate delay in passing the order of detention.

4. In the instant case, the detenu was arrested on 15.08.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 15.10.2024. 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 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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.3129 of 2024

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.

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



H.C.P.No.3129 of 2024

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 No.175/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 15.10.2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Kavi @ Kaviyarasu, S/o.John Suresh, aged 38 years, (who is presently under going detention in the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai), 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.)

19.12.2024

Index: Yes

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Sni



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.3129 of 2024

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
and
M.JOTHIRAMAN, J.

Sni

To

1.The Principal Secretary to State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat Complex,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Office of Commissioner of Police,
Avadi – 600 054.

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

4.The Inspector of Police, L&O
T-10 Thirumullaivoyal Police Station,
Chennai District.

5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras, Chennai.

H.C.P.No.3129 of 2024

19.12.2024