



H.C.P.No.130 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 13.02.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N. SENTHILKUMAR

H.C.P.No.130 of 2025

Rajendiran

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, St.George Fort,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Chennai.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Special Prison for Women,
Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.

4.The Inspector of Police,
R-10, M.G.R. Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondents

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



H.C.P.No.130 of 2025

detention order in No.1000/BCDFGISSSV/2024, dated 01.10.2024, passed by the 2nd respondent to produce the petitioner's daughter namely Sangeetha, W/o.Parthiban, aged about 28 years, the detinue now confined in Special Prison for Women, Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066, before this Court and set the petitioner's daughter Sangeetha, W/o.Parthiban, aged about 28 years, the detinue herein at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.M.Ramakrishnan

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

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by *M.S. RAMESH, J.*)

The petitioner herein, who is the father of the detinue namely Sangeetha, aged about 28 years, W/o.Parthiban, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 01.10.2024 slapped on his daughter, branding her 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 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].



H.C.P.No.130 of 2025

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 28.07.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 01.10.2024. 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 quashed the detention order on this ground.



H.C.P.No.130 of 2025

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 01.10.2024 in No.1000/BCDFGISSSV/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenue viz., Sangeetha, Female, aged about 28 years, W/o.Parthiban, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless her confinement is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R, J.]

[N.S, J.]

13.02.2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking order/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Sni



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.130 of 2025

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

Sni

To

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, St.George Fort, Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Chennai.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Special Prison for Women,
Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.

4.The Inspector of Police,
R-10, M.G.R. Nagar Police Station, Chennai.

5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.130 of 2025

13.02.2025