



HCP.No.313 of 2025

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 18.03.2025

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.313 of 2025

Jasmine

... Petitioner/
Wife of the detenu

Vs.

1. The State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 9.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai - 600 066.
4. The Inspector of Police,
S 9, Pazhavanthangal Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondents



HCP.No.313 of 2025

WEB COPY

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the entire records leading to the detention of the petitioners husband Manir Hossain son of Sarbath Ali, Male aged about 36 years is presently lodged in Central prison, Puzhal, Chennai and has been detained under Act 14/82 as a Drug Offender vide detention order dated 20.11.2024 made in BCDFGISSSV No.1144/2024 by the Commissioner of police, Greater Chennai, Vepery, Chennai the 2nd respondent herein and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the body and person of the said detenu before this Honble court and thereafter set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Rajavelu

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyaparaj
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 viz., Manir Hossain, S/o.Sarbath Ali, aged about 36 years, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 20.11.2024 slapped



HCP.No.313 of 2025

WEB COPY

on her husband, 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].

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 08.10.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 20.11.2024. This fact is not disputed by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor.

5. In the case of '*Sushanta Kumar Banik Vs. State of Tripura*',




HCP.No.313 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 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**



HCP.No.313 of 2025

WEB COPY

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.313 of 2025

WEB COPY

8. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 20.11.2024 in BCDFGISSSV No.1144/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Manir Hossain, aged 36 years, S/o. Sarbath Ali, 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.

[M.S.R, J.]

[N.S, J.]

18.03.2025

ASI

To

1. The State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 9.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai - 600 066.



HCP.No.313 of 2025

WEB COPY

4. The Inspector of Police,
S 9, Pazhavanthangal Police Station,
Chennai.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.313 of 2025

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

ASI

H.C.P.No.313 of 2025

18.03.2025