



WEB COPY



HCP.No.401 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 24.06.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.401 of 2025

KULSAM

Petitioner(s) /wife of the detenue

Vs

1. The Secretary To Government
Government Of Tamil Nadu (home)
Prohibition And Excise Department,
Fort St George, Chennai

2.The District Collector And District
Magistrate
Krishnagiri District, Krishnagiri.

3.The Superintendtn of Police
Krishnagiri District, Krishnagiri

4.The Superintendent
Central Prison, Salem.

5.The Inspector Of Police
Krishnagiri Town Police Station,
Krishnagiri District

Respondents



HCP.No.401 of 2025

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records relating to the impugned order SC No. 47/2024 dated 30.12.2024 on the file of the 2nd respondent to produce detenu namely Yunosh Ushen, son of Rayath Ali, aged about 22 years, now Confined at Central Prison, Salem, before this court set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Panneer Selvan

For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

The petitioner herein, who is the wife of the detenu, Yunosh Ushen, son of Rayath Ali, aged about 22 years, now Confined at Central Prison, Salem, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 30.12.2024 issued against 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,



HCP.No.401 of 2025

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 08.11.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 30.12.2024. 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




HCP.No.401 of 2025

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 Banik's case***, a co-ordinate Bench of this Court in the case of '***Gomathi Vs.***



HCP.No.401 of 2025

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.

8. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 30.12.2024 in SC No. 47/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Yunosh Ushen, son of Rayath Ali, aged about 22 years, now Confined at Central Prison, Salem, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with



HCP.No.401 of 2025

any other case.

WEB COPY

[M.S.R., J] [V.L.N., J]
24.06.2025

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

To

1. The Secretary To Government
Government Of Tamil Nadu (home)
Prohibition And Excise Department,
Fort St George, Chennai


2. The District Collector And District
Magistrate
Krishnagiri District, Krishnagiri.

3. The Superintendent of Police
Krishnagiri District, Krishnagiri

4. The Superintendent
Central Prison, Salem.

5. The Inspector Of Police
Krishnagiri Town Police Station,
Krishnagiri District

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



7. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

WEB COPY



HCP.No.401 of 2025

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.
Anu



WEB COPY



HCP.No.401 of 2025

H.C.P.No.401 of 2025

24.06.2025