



HCP.No.67 of 2025

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 29.01.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN

H.C.P.No.67 of 2025

Geetha

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep by Secretary to the Government,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai
Chennai – 600 007.

3.The Inspector of Police
P4 Basin Bridge Police Station
Chennai – 600 012.

4. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison Puzhal, Chennai

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to
issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records pertaining to Memo
No.1260/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 18.12.2024 on the file of the 2nd



HCP.No.67 of 2025

respondent herein and set aside the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's son Karthick s/o.Harikrishnan aged 26 years now confined in the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.Charles Kamalesh M.Appaji

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

ORDER

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

The order of detention passed by the 2nd respondent in Memo No.1260/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 18.12.2024 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.

3. 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 16.11.2024 and



HCP.No.67 of 2025

thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 18.12.2024. 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 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



HCP.No.67 of 2025

WEB COPY

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.

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.



HCP.No.67 of 2025

WEB COPY

8. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent in Memo No.1260/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 18.12.2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Karthick, Male aged 26 years S/o.Harikrishnan who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

[S.M.S., J.]

[M.J.R., J.]

29.01.2025

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

tsh



WEB COPY



HCP.No.67 of 2025

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

tsh

To

1.The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep by Secretary to the Government,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai
Chennai – 600 007.

3.The Inspector of Police
P4 Basin Bridge Police Station
Chennai – 600 012.

4. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison Puzhal, Chennai

5.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.

H.C.P.No.67 of 2025



WEB COPY



HCP.No.67 of 2025

29.01.2025