



HCP.No.10 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED : 28.01.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN


H.C.P.No.10 of 2025

Kommaiah

... Petitioner/Father of the
detenu

Vs.

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort st.George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Tiruppur District,
Tiruppur.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Tiruppur,
Tiruppur District.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison - Coimbatore,
Coimbatore District.



HCP.No.10 of 2025

WEB COPY

5. State represented by its
The Inspector of Police,
Palladam Police Station,
Tiruppur 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 relating to the petitioner's son detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order dated 18.10.2024 on the file of the second respondent herein made in proceedings Cr.M.P.No.89/Goonda/2024, quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's son namely Suresh, S/o. Kommaiah, aged 25 years, before this Court and set the petitioner's son at liberty from detention, now the petitioner's son detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore.

For Petitioner	: Mr.W.Camyles Gandhi
For Respondents	: Mr. R.Muniyapparaj Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by the Hon'ble *S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.*)

The preventive detention order passed by the second respondent in proceedings Cr.M.P.No.89/GOONDA/2024 dated 18.10.2024 is sought to be quashed in the present habeas corpus petition.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.



HCP.No.10 of 2025


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 01.09.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 18.10.2024. 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 decisions of this Court, that the underlying principle is that if there is unreasonable delay between the date of the order of



HCP.No.10 of 2025

WEB COPY

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.



HCP.No.10 of 2025

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. Further, five adverse cases are relied on by the detaining Authority for passing the impugned detention order. Pertinently, three adverse cases are registered in the year 2022 and two adverse cases are registered in the year 2023. The ground case in Crime No.837/2024 was registered under Section 309 (4), 311 of B.N.S., 2023. The alleged robbed cash of a sum of Rs.1,000/- was recovered from the detenu. He was arrested on the same day on 01.09.2024 and the detention order was passed on 18.10.2024. More-so, the ground case and other adverse cases registered long before, can be dealt with by the police Authorities under the ordinary law and by following the due procedures.




HCP.No.10 of 2025

9. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent, in proceedings Cr.M.P.No.89/GOONDA/2024 dated 18.10.2024 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is **allowed**. The detenu *viz.*, Suresh, aged 25 years, S/o. Kommaiah confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless he is required in connection with any other case.

[S.M.S., J.] [M.J.R., J.]
28.01.2025

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



HCP.No.10 of 2025

To

WEB COPY

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort st.George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and Order) Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 9.
3. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Tiruppur District,
Tiruppur.
4. The Superintendent of Police,
Tiruppur,
Tiruppur District.
5. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison - Coimbatore,
Coimbatore District.
6. The Inspector of Police,
Palladam Police Station,
Tiruppur District.
7. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai - 104.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.10 of 2025

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

veda

H.C.P.No.10 of 2025

28.01.2025