



H.C.P.(MD) No.235 of 2024

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 30.04.2024

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR**

H.C.P.(MD) No.235 of 2024

Karthikeyan @ Kundu Karthick

... Petitioner

-VS-

- 1.The Government of Tamil Nadu,
rep. by its the Additional Chief Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
District Collector Office,
Pudukottai District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
District Superintendent Office,
Pudukottai District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirapalli District.



H.C.P.(MD) No.235 of 2024

WEB COPY

5.The Inspector of Police,
Namanasamuthiram Police Station,
Pudukottai District.

... 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 the Detention Order passed in P.D.O.No.17/2023, dated 13.10.2023 on the file of the second respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to Thiru.Karthikeyan @ Kundu Karthick, M/A 32 years, S/o.Palaniyappan, now confined in Central Prison, Tiruchirapalli District before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Padmanabhan

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.]

The petitioner is the detenu viz., Karthikeyan @ Kundu Karthick, son of Palaniyappan, aged about 32 years. The detenu has been detained by the



H.C.P.(MD) No.235 of 2024

WEB COPY

second respondent by his order in P.D.O.No.17/2023, dated 13.10.2023 holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this habeas corpus petition.

2. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents. We have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.

3. Though several grounds have been raised in the habeas corpus petition, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would mainly focus his arguments on the ground that there is an inordinate delay between the arrest of the detenu and passing the impugned detention order. In this case, the detenu was arrested on 04.08.2023, and the impugned detention order came to be passed only on 13.10.2023, i.e., after a lapse of 1-1/2 months. This inordinate delay in passing the detention order would vitiate the same. He further submitted that there is no live and proximate link between the date of arrest and the date of the detention order. Hence, on this ground, the present impugned detention order is also liable to be set aside.



H.C.P.(MD) No.235 of 2024

WEB COPY

the date of actual arrest and the date of detention order, the Honourable Supreme Court has held that the live and proximate link, between the grounds and the purpose of detention, stands snapped throwing a considerable doubt on the genuineness of the requisite satisfaction of the detaining authority in passing the detention order unless such delay is satisfactorily explained and consequently making it invalid. The relevant portion 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 unexplained depends on the facts and circumstances of



H.C.P.(MD) No.235 of 2024

WEB COPY

each case."

7. In view of the above, as pointed out by the counsel for the petitioner, the delay has not been satisfactorily explained, thereby vitiating and invalidating the detention order.

8. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in P.D.O.No.17/2023, dated 13.10.2023, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Karthikeyan @ Kundu Karthick, son of Palaniyappan, aged about 32 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[A.D.J.C., J.] [K.R.S., J.]

30.04.2024

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No

am



H.C.P.(MD) No.235 of 2024

WEB COPY

To:

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
District Collector Office,
Pudukottai District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
District Superintendent Office,
Pudukottai District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirapalli District.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Namanasamuthiram Police Station,
Pudukottai District.
- 6.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.235 of 2024

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.
AND
K.RAJASEKAR, J.
am

H.C.P.(MD) No.235 of 2024

30.04.2024