



WEB COPY



1

H.C.P.(MD)NO.1228 OF 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 16.12.2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.R.SWAMINATHAN

AND

THE HON'BLE MS.JUSTICE R. POORNIMA

H.C.P.(MD)No.1228 of 2024

Muthulakshmi

... Petitioner / Mother of the detenu

Vs.

1. State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. By the Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 9.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thoothukudi District,
Thoothukudi.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Madurai,
Madurai District.

... Respondents

Prayer: Habeas Corpus petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records connected with the detention order passed in H.S(M)Confdl.No.67/2024 dated 26.05.2024 on the file of the second



respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu or body of the detenu namely the petitioner's son i.e., Shanmugapandi, aged about 23 years, S/o.Arjunapandian, now detained at the Central Prison, Madurai before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Pragalathan
For Respondents : Mr.T.Senthil Kumar,
Additional Public Prosecutor.
* * *

ORDER

(Order of the Court was delivered by G.R.SWAMINATHAN, J.)

Heard both sides.

2. The petitioner's son was detained as Goonda by the second respondent vide order dated 26.05.2024. The occurrence had taken place on 23.04.2024 and the detenu was arrested on 04.05.2024. There is a gap of more than 32 days between the date of occurrence and the date of detention order. The case of the petitioner is that on account of the delay in passing the detention order, the live and proximate link between the grounds and the purpose of detention stood snapped.

3. The petitioner's counsel relies on the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in **(2022 Livelaw (SC) 813) (Sushanta Kumar**



Banik Vs. State of Tripura). The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the said decision held as follows:-

“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.”

4. We are satisfied that the aforesaid decision clearly applies to the case on hand. The detention order is quashed on this ground. He shall be set at liberty forthwith unless his detention is otherwise warranted by law. The Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed.

(G.R.SWAMINATHAN, J.) & (R. POORNIMA, J.)

16th December 2024

NCC : Yes / No

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes / No

PMU

Note : Issue order copy on 17.12.2024.



WEB COPY



To:

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 9.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thoothukudi District,
Thoothukudi.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Madurai,
Madurai District.
5. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



5

H.C.P.(MD)NO.1228 OF 2024

G.R.SWAMINATHAN, J.

AND

R. POORNIMA, J.

PMU

H.C.P.(MD)No.1228 of 2024

16.12.2024