



WEB COPY



HCP.No.140 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 14.03.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

H.C.P.No.140 of 2025

SANTHI

Petitioner(s) /wife of the detenue

Vs

1. The Principal Secretary To
Government
Home Prohibition And Excise
Department, Fort St George, Chennai
600 009

2.The Commissioner Of Police/
Detaining Authority, Tiruppur City

3.The Superintendent
Central Prison, Coimbatore

4.The Inspector Of Police
Nallur Police Station,
Tiruppur City

Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to
issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the



HCP.No.140 of 2025

detention order passed by the second respondent pertaining to the order made in C.NO. 77/G/IS/TIRUPPUR CITY/2024 dated 13.09.2024 in detain the detenue under 2(f) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982, as a Goonda and quash the same and direct the respondent to produce the detenue Vallinayagam @ Valli son of Palavesakannu, aged about 33 years, detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore before this court and set him at liberty.


For Petitioner : Mr.G.Nirmal Krishnan

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor
assisted by Mr.M.Sylvester John

ORDER

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

The petitioner herein, who is the wife of the detenu, Vallinayagam @ Valli son of Palavesakannu, aged about 33 years, detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 13.09.2024 slapped on her husband, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Sexual Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982



HCP.No.140 of 2025

[Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].


WEB COPY

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

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 31.07.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 13.09.2024. 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

“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



HCP.No.140 of 2025

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.

8. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 13.09.2024 in C.NO.77/G/IS/TIRUPPUR CITY/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Vallinayagam @ Valli son of Palavesakannu, aged about 33 years, detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R., J] [N.S., J]
14.03.2025

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Internet: Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No



WEB COPY



HCP.No.140 of 2025

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.
Anu

To

1. The Principal Secretary To
Government
Home Prohibition And Excise
Department, Fort St George, Chennai
600 009

2.The Commissioner Of Police/
Detaining Authority, Tiruppur City

3.The Superintendent
Central Prison, Coimbatore

4.The Inspector Of Police
Nallur Police Station,
Tiruppur City

5.The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai

6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.140 of 2025

14.03.2025