



H.C.P.No.2835 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED: 21.01.2025

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
AND
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN

H.C.P.No.2835 of 2024

Jesudoss

S/o Anthonysamy

..

Petitioner

v.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu
rep.by its Secretary to Government (Home)
Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat, Fort St.George, Chennai 600 009
 2. The District Collector and District Magistrate
Tiruvarur District, Tiruvarur
 3. The Superintendent of Police
Tiruvarur District, Tiruvarur
 4. The Superintendent of Prison
Now at District Prison, Pudukkottai
Pudukkottai District
 5. The Inspector of Police
Needamangalam Police Station
Tiruvarur District
- .. Respondents



H.C.P.No.2835 of 2024

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records pertaining to the order of detention passed in C.O.C.No.34/2024 dated on 28.09.2024 passed by the 2nd respondent and set aside the same and directing the respondents to produce the petitioner's son by name Manoj @ Manonirmalraj, Son of Jesudoss, aged about 25 years, before this Hon'ble Court, now confined in District Prison, Pudukottai and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner :: Ms.R.Pandimeena

For Respondents :: Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by S.M.SUBRAMANIAM,J.)

The petitioner, who is the father of the detenu, viz., Manoj @ Manonirmalraj, S/o Jesudoss, aged 25 years, now confined at Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli/District Prison, Pudukottai has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent in proceedings C.O.C.No.34/2024 dated 28.09.2024.

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



H.C.P.No.2835 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 17.08.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 28.09.2024. 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:-



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2835 of 2024

“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.”

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



H.C.P.No.2835 of 2024

quashed the detention order on this ground.

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. Moreover, the ground case was registered on account of personal vengeance between the de-facto complainant and the accused person. Such criminal case can be dealt with by the police authorities under the ordinary law.

8. In view of the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent in proceedings C.O.C No.34/2024 dated 28.09.2024 is hereby set aside and the habeas corpus petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Manoj @ Manonirmalraj, S/o Jesudoss, aged 25 years, now confined at Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli/District Prison, Pudukkottai is directed to be



H.C.P.No.2835 of 2024

set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection
with any other case.

Index : yes/no

(S.M.S.,J.)

(M.J.R.,J.)

Neutral citation : yes/no

21.01.2025

SS

To

1. The Secretary to Government (Home)
Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat, Fort St.George, Chennai 600 009
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate
Tiruvarur District, Tiruvarur
3. The Superintendent of Police
Tiruvarur District, Tiruvarur
4. The Superintendent of Prison
District Prison, Pudukkottai
5. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli
6. The Inspector of Police
Needamangalam Police Station
Tiruvarur District
7. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2835 of 2024

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM,J.

AND

M.JOTHIRAMAN,J.

SS

H.C.P.No.2835 of 2024

21.01.2025