



WEB COPY



HCP.No.3095 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 17.12.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.3095 of 2024

Gnanasowndari

...

Petitioner /
Mother of the detainee

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by
The Additional Chief Secretary to Government
Department of Home, Prohibition and Excise,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.
Office of Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai – 17
3. Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison Puzhal II,
Puzhal, Chennai.
4. Inspector of Police, L&O
P5 MKB Nagar Police Station,
Chennai

...

Respondents



HCP.No.3095 of 2024

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records in Memo No.1079/BCDFGISSSV/2024 passed by the 2nd respondent on 24.10.2024 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondent to produce the petitioner son Soosai Arokiyadoss, son of Mariya Anthony aged about 50 years before this Court, who now detained in Central prison, Puzhal II and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Elumalai
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 herein in Memo No.1079/BCDFGISSSV/2024 is sought to be quashed in the present Habeas Corpus Petition.

2. The ground taken in the present petition is that the detenue was arrested on 06.09.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 24.10.2024. This fact is not disputed by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor.

3. In this regard, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of '*Sushanta Kumar Banik Vs. State of Tripura*', reported in '*2022 LiveLaw (SC)*



HCP.No.3095 of 2024

813' held as follows:

WEB COPY

“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 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.”

3.1. In the case of ***T.A. Abdul Rahaman Vs. State of Kerala and Ors.***

reported in ***(1989) 4 SCC 741***, the Apex Court held as follows:



WEB COPY



HCP.No.3095 of 2024

10. The conspectus of the above decisions can be summarised thus : The question whether the prejudicial activities of a person necessitating to pass an order of detention is proximate to the time when the order is made or the live-link between the prejudicial activities and the purpose of detention is snapped depends on the facts and circumstances of each case. No hard and fast rule can be precisely formulated that would be applicable under all circumstances and no exhaustive guidelines can be laid down in that behalf. It follows that the test of proximity is not a rigid or mechanical test by merely counting number of months between the offending acts and the order of detention. However, when there is undue and long delay between the prejudicial activities and the passing of detention order, the Court has to scrutinise whether the detaining authority has satisfactorily examined such a delay and afforded a tenable and reasonable explanation as to why such a delay has occasioned, when called upon to answer and



further the Court has to investigate whether the causal connection has been broken in the circumstances of each case.

11. Similarly when there is unsatisfactory and unexplained delay between the date of order of detention and the date of securing the arrest of the detenu, such a delay would throw considerable doubt on the genuineness of the subjective satisfaction of the detaining authority leading to a legitimate inference that the detaining authority was not really and genuinely satisfied as regards the necessity for detaining the detenu with a view to preventing him from acting in a prejudicial manner.

4. The fact about the long delay would be sufficient to draw an inference that the detaining authority has failed to apply their mind for the purpose of issuing the impugned order under Act 14 of 1982.

5. Accordingly, the impugned order of detention in Memo No.1079/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 24.10.2024 is quashed and the Habeas



HCP.No.3095 of 2024

Corpus Petition stands **allowed**. The detenue, namely, Soosai Arokiyadoss, Male aged 50 years S/o..Mariya Anthony, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal II, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless he is otherwise required in connection with any other case.

[S.M.S., J.] [M.J.R., J.]
17.12.2024

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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.3095 of 2024

To

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by
The Additional Chief Secretary to Government
Department of Home, Prohibition and Excise,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.
Office of Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai – 17
3. Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison Puzhal II,
Puzhal, Chennai.
4. Inspector of Police, L&O
P5 MKB Nagar Police Station,
Chennai
5. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.3095 of 2024

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

rka

H.C.P.No.3095 of 2024

17.12.2024