



H.C.P.(MD)No.1105 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 21.01.2025

CORAM

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

H.C.P.(MD)No.1105 of 2024

Mariraj

... Petitioner / Detenue

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu

Rep. by the Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thoothukudi District,
Thoothukudi.

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

4.The Superintendent,
District Jail,
Perurani,
Thoothukudi District.

... Respondents



H.C.P.(MD)No.1105 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 entire records connected with the detention order passed in H.S.(M) Confdl No. 99/2024, dated 08.07.2024 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 Mariraj, aged about 32 years, S/o.Palsamy, now detained at the District Jail, Perurani, Thoothukudi District 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 was detained as Goonda vide order dated 08.07.2024. The occurrence which led to passing detention order took place on 07.06.2024. The petitioner was arrested on 09.06.2024. The detention order was passed on 08.07.2024. There is a gap of more than 31 days between the date of occurrence and the date of passing of the detention order. It has been consistently held that there must be



H.C.P.(MD)No.1105 of 2024

proximate and live-link between the event that gave rise to an apprehension that there would be breach of public order and the date of passing of the detention order.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner drew out attention to the decision reported in (1989) 4 SCC 741 (*T.A.Abdul Rahan Vs. State of Kerala*). Paragraph Nos.10 & 11 of the said decision read as follows:-

“10. The conspectus of the above decisions can be summarised thus: The question whether the prejudicial activities of a person necessitating to pass an order of detention is proximate to the time when the order is made or the live-link between the prejudicial activities and the purpose of detention is snapped depends on the facts and circumstances of each case. No hard and fast rule can be precisely formulated that would be applicable under all circumstances and no exhaustive guidelines can be laid down in that behalf. It follows that the test of proximity is not a rigid or mechanical test by merely counting number of months between the offending acts and the order of detention. However, when there is undue and long delay between the prejudicial activities and the passing of detention order, the Court has to scrutinise whether the detaining authority has satisfactorily examined such a delay and afforded a tenable and reasonable explanation as to why such a delay has occasioned, when called upon to answer and further the Court has to investigate whether the causal connection has been broken in the circumstances of each case.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.1105 of 2024

11. Similarly when there is unsatisfactory and unexplained delay between the date of order of detention and the date of securing the arrest of the detenu, such a delay would throw considerable doubt on the genuineness of the subjective satisfaction of the detaining authority leading to a legitimate inference that the detaining authority was not really and genuinely satisfied as regards the necessity for detaining the detenu with a view to preventing him from acting in a prejudicial manner.”

4.The ratio laid down in the above case squarely applies to the case on hand. We are more than satisfied that the proximate and live-link stood snapped in this case. In this view of the matter, the order impugned in this petition is set aside. The detenue shall be set at liberty forthwith unless his detention is otherwise warranted by law. The Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed.

(G.R.S. J.) & (R.P. J.)
21.01.2025

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

NOTE:Issue order Copy on 22.01.2025



H.C.P.(MD)No.1105 of 2024

WEB COPY

To:-

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thoothukudi District,
Thoothukudi.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli.
- 4.The Superintendent,
District Jail,
Perurani,
Thoothukudi District.
- 5.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.1105 of 2024

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

rmi

H.C.P.(MD)No.1105 of 2024

21.01.2025