



H.C.P.No.17 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 01.03.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.17 of 2024

Sivarajjani

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. State of Tamil Nadu
Represented by its Additional Chief Secretary
to Government,
Prohibition and Excise Department (Home)
Fort St. George, Chennai 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thiruvarur District, Thiruvarur.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Thiruvarur District, Thiruvarur.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Special Prison for Women,
Central Prison, Thiruchirapalli.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Prohibition Enforcement Wing
Thiruvarur District.

... Respondents



H.C.P.No.17 of 2024

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records pertaining to the detention order dated 25.10.2023 in C.O.C. No.55/2023 passed by the 2nd respondent and issue direction to produce the body of the detainee namely Savithiri, W.o. Kumar, aged 59 years, presently confined at Special Prison for Women, Central Prison, Thiruchirappalli, before this Hon'ble Court and set her at liberty and quash the same.

For petitioner : Mr.Swami Subramanian
For Respondents : Mr.A. Gokulakrishnan
Additional Public Prosecutor
Assisted by Aravind.C

ORDER

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

The petitioner, daughter of the detainee namely Savithiri, W/o.Kumar, aged 59 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 25.10.2023, in C.O.C. No.55/2023, slapped on her mother branding her as "Bootlegger" as contemplated under Section 2(b) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14/1982.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned



H.C.P.No.17 of 2024

Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

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 13.09.2023 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 25.10.2023. 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



H.C.P.No.17 of 2024

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.No.17 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 2nd respondent dated 25.10.2023, in C.O.C. No.55/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenue viz., Savithiri, aged 59 years, W/o. Kumar, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless he is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R., J] [S.M., J]
01.03.2024

bga

5/7



H.C.P.No.17 of 2024

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary
to Government,
Prohibition and Excise Department (Home)
Fort St. George, Chennai 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thiruvarur District, Thiruvarur.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Thiruvarur District, Thiruvarur.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Special Prison for Women,
Central Prison, Thiruchirapalli.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Prohibition Enforcement Wing
Thiruvarur District.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
7. The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.17 of 2024

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

bga

H.C.P.No.17 of 2024

01.03.2024