



HCP.No.2497 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.03.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.2497 of 2023

Keerthana

... Petitioner/wife of the detenu

***Vs.***

1.State rep. by  
The Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Fort St. George,  
Chennai-9

2.The District Collector  
and District Magistrate,  
Villupuram District,  
Villupuram.

3.The Superintendent of Police,  
Villupuram District,  
Viluppuram.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison,  
Cuddalore.



HCP.No.2497 of 2023

5. The Inspector of Police,  
Vikravandi Police Station,  
Villupuram.

... Respondents

**PRAYER:** Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records in Rc.No.C2/72062/2023, dated 28.11.2023 on the file of the second respondent and quash the detention as illegal and direct the respondents to produce the detenu, Thiru. Pugazhendhi, S/o.Poongavanam, aged about 32 years, now confined at Central Prison, Cuddalore, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Ms.S.Sengkodi

For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak  
Additional Public Prosecutor  
assisted by Mr.C. Aravind

### **ORDER**

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

The petitioner herein, who is the wife of the detenu viz., Pugazhendhi, S/o.Poongavanam, aged about 32 years, now confined at Central Prison, Cuddalore, has come forward with this petition challenging



HCP.No.2497 of 2023

the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 28.11.2023 slapped on her husband, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu 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 Additional 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 an inordinate delay in passing the order of detention.

4. In the instant case, the detenu was arrested on 22.10.2023 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 28.11.2023. This fact is not disputed by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor.



HCP.No.2497 of 2023

WEB COPY

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 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*



HCP.No.2497 of 2023

WEB COPY

*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 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.



HCP.No.2497 of 2023

WEB COPY

8. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 28.11.2023 in Rc.No.C2/72062/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Pugazhendhi, S/o.Poongavanam, aged about 32 years, now confined at Central Prison, Cuddalore, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

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

27.03.2024

Index: Yes/No  
Internet: Yes/No  
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

**Anu**

To

1.The Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Fort St. George,  
Chennai-9

2.The District Collector  
and District Magistrate,  
Villupuram District,  
Villupuram.



*HCP.No.2497 of 2023*

WEB COPY

3.The Superintendent of Police,  
Villupuram District,  
Viluppuram.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison,  
Cuddalore.

5.The Inspector of Police,  
Vikravandi Police Station,  
Villupuram.

6.The Joint Secretary,  
Law and Order Department,  
Secretariat, Chennai.

7.The Public Prosecutor,  
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



*HCP.No.2497 of 2023*

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

*Anu*

H.C.P.No.2497 of 2023

27.03.2024