



H.C.P.(MD)No.966 of 2024

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 28.01.2025

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.R.SWAMINATHAN
and
THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA**

H.C.P.(MD)No.966 of 2024

K.Vimala

... Petitioner / Wife of the Detenu

Vs.

**1.State represented by,
The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-9.**

**2.The District Collector and
District Magistrate,
Tenkasi District, Tenkasi.**

**3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli District.**

... Respondents



H.C.P.(MD)No.966 of 2024

PRAYER : Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issue of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records from the second respondent in M.H.S.Confdl No.57 of 2024, dated 11.07.2024 by setting aside the said order of detention passed by the second respondent and setting the detenue Nirmalkumar S/o.Sankarapandian, aged about 36 years at liberty now detained in the Central Prison, Palayamkottai.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Prabhu

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 husband was detained as “Goonda” vide order dated 11.07.2024 by the second respondent. The occurrence had taken place on 30.05.2024. The detenue was arrested on 01.06.2024. However, the detention order came to be passed only on 11.07.2024. There is a gap of more than 41 days between the date of arrest and the date of passing of the detention order.



H.C.P.(MD)No.966 of 2024

WEB COPY

3. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Sushanta Kumar Banik Vs.*

State of Tripura reported in (2022 Livelaw (SC) 813) 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. In this case, there is an inordinate delay from the date of arrest till the date of detention. The “live and proximate link” between the two got snapped. The detention order is quashed on this ground. The detenue shall be set at liberty forthwith unless his detention is otherwise warranted by law.



H.C.P.(MD)No.966 of 2024

5. The Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed.

WEB COPY

(G.R.S. J.,) & (R.P. J.,)
28.01.2025

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

Note: Issue Order Copy on 29.01.2025.

To:-

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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.966 of 2024

G.R.SWAMINATHAN, J.
and
R.POORNIMA, J.

rmi

H.C.P.(MD)No.966 of 2024

28.01.2025