



WEB COPY



HCP.No.502 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21.04.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

H.C.P.No.502 of 2025

D.Viruthika

Petitioner(s) /wife of the detenue

Vs

1. The State Of Tamilnadu, Represented By
Secretary To Government Prohibition And Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.

2.The Commissioner Of Police
Greater Chennai, Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.

3.The Inspector Of Police
Prohibition Enforcement Wing,
St.Thomas Mount, Chennai.

4.The Superintendent Of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

Respondent(s)

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 detention order dated 26-04-2024 passed by the 2nd respondent herein in his proceedings Memo No.BCDFGIISSSV No.417/2024 under the Tamilnadu Act 14 of 1982 and to quash the same and direct the respondents



HCP.No.502 of 2025

herein to produce the petitioner's husband namely Dhineshkumar, aged 38 years now under detention as Goondas in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Angamuthu
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, Dhineshkumar, aged 38 years, detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 26.04.2024 issued against 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



HCP.No.502 of 2025

Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.


WEB COPY

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 16.03.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 26.04.2024. 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:-

“20. It is manifestly clear from a conspectus of the above



WEB COPY



HCP.No.502 of 2025

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***',



HCP.No.502 of 2025


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 26.04.2024 in BCDFGISSSV No.417/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Dhineshkumar, aged 38 years, detained 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]
21.04.2025

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

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and



HCP.No.502 of 2025

N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

Anu

WEB COPY

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

2. The Commissioner Of Police
Greater Chennai, Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.

3. The Inspector Of Police
Prohibition Enforcement Wing, St.Thomas Mount, Chennai.

4. The Superintendent Of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

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

6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.502 of 2025

21.04.2025