



H.C.P.(MD)No.1468 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 06.01.2025

CORAM

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

H.C.P.(MD)No.1468 of 2024

Murugalakshmi

... Petitioner / Aunt of the Detenue

Vs.

1.The Additional Secretary to Government of India,
Department of Consumer Affairs,
Food and Consumers Affairs Department,
Room No.270, Food, Krishi Bhavan,
New Delhi-110001.

2.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Department of Co-operation Food and Consumer Protection,
Secretariat, Chennai-9.

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

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Palayamkottai Central Prison,
Tirunelveli District.

... Respondents



H.C.P.(MD)No.1468 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 of the third respondent in H.S.(M).Confdl.No.120 / 2024, dated 29.08.2024 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detinue by name Karpagaraja S/o.Murugan, aged about 24 years now detained in Palayamkottai Central Prison, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Paramasivan
Senior Counsel
for Mr.R.Vinoth Bharath

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 nephew was detained as Black Marketer vide order dated 29.08.2024 by the third respondent. The occurrence had taken place on 25.04.2024. He was arrested on 13.08.2024. The detention order was passed on 29.08.2024. There is a clear gap of more



H.C.P.(MD)No.1468 of 2024

than four months between the occurrence date and the date of passing of the detention order. It has been consistently held that there must be 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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.1468 of 2024

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.

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.)
06.01.2025

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

NOTE:Issue order Copy on 07.01.2025



H.C.P.(MD)No.1468 of 2024

WEB COPY

To:-

- 1.The Additional Secretary to Government of India,
Department of Consumer Affairs,
Food and Consumers Affairs Department,
Room No.270, Food, Krishi Bhavan,
New Delhi-110001.
- 2.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Department of Co-operation Food and Consumer Protection,
Secretariat, Chennai-9.
- 3.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thoothukudi District,
Thoothukudi.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Palayamkottai Central Prison,
Tirunelveli District.
- 5.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.1468 of 2024

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

rmi

H.C.P.(MD)No.1468 of 2024

06.01.2025