



WEB COPY

HCP No. 202 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 01-04-2025

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR**

HCP No. 202 of 2025

1. Loovis Mary
W/o.Samuvel, Raj Apartment,
No.25/16, Bharathi Road, Perambur,
Chennai-11.


Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State Of Tamilnadu Rep.By Its
Additional Chief Secretary To
Government, Home, Prohibition And
Excise Department, Secretariat,
Chennai-9.

2.The Commissioner Of Police
Greater Chennai Police, Vepery,
Chennai-7.

3.The Inspector Of Police
(Law And Order)
K-2, Ayanavaram Police Station,
Chennai.



4. The Superintendent

Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

WEB COPY

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

To issue a writ order or direction in the nature of a writ of Habeas Corpus petition calling for the records of the detention made in Memo No.1292/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 28.12.2024 passed by the Commissioner of police, Greater Chennai police, Vepery, Chennai 7 the second respondent herein and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenue before this Honble court and set the detenue Martin Joshua Thimothi, son of Samuvel aged 31 years now confined in Central Prison II, Puzhal, Chennai and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner(s): M/s.R.Balakrishnan

For Respondent(s): Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor
Assisted by Mr.Sylvester John

ORDER

M.S.RAMESH, J.

AND

N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

The petitioner, who is the mother of the detenu viz., Martin Joshua Thimothi, S/o.Samuvel, aged about 31 years, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 28.12.2024 branding him as "Drug Offender" 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].

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 13.11.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 28.12.2024. 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:-



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.

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.

WEB COPY

8. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 28.12.2024 in No.1292/BCDFGISSSV/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Martin Joshua Thimothi, S/o.Samuvel, aged about 31 years, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

(M.S.RAMESH J.) (N.SENTHILKUMAR J.)

01-04-2025

ASI

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No



To
WEB COPY

1. The Additional Chief Secretary To
Government, Home, Prohibition And
Excise Department, Secretariat,
Chennai-9.
2. The Commissioner Of Police
Greater Chennai Police, Vepery,
Chennai-7.
3. The Inspector Of Police
(Law And Order)
K-2, Ayanavaram Police Station,
Chennai.
4. The Superintendent
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras, Chennai.



WEB COPY

HCP No. 202 of 2025



M.S.RAMESH J.
AND
N.SENTHILKUMAR J.

ASI

HCP No. 202 of 2025

01-04-2025