



WEB COPY

HCP No. 553 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

**DATED: 03-06-2025**

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH**

**AND**

**THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN**

**HCP No. 553 of 2025**

Prabakaran

Petitioner

Vs

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition And Excise Department,  
Secretariat, Chennai-9.

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

3. The Superintendent Of Police,  
Coimbatore District, Coimbatore.

4. The Superintendent, Central Prison,  
Coimbatore.

5. The Inspector Of Police  
Mettupalyam All Women Police Station,  
Coimbatore District.

Respondents



**PRAYER :** Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records in Cr. M.P.No.69/S.O/2024 on the file of the second respondent, quash the detention order dated 09.11.2024 and direct the respondent to produce of the detenue Vijakaumar son of Balakrishnan Das presently detained as a Sexual Offender at the Central Prison, Coimbatore, under the Tami Nadu Act of 1982 before this Court and set him at liberty.


For Petitioner : Mr.K.R.Samratt

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

### **ORDER**

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

The petitioner herein, who is the brother of the detenu namely Vijayakumar aged about 36 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 09.11.2024 issued against his brother, 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, 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 08.10.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 09.11.2024. This fact is not disputed by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor.

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

*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.

8. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 09.11.2024 in Cr.M.P.No.69/S.C/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Vijayakumar, aged about 36 years, S/o.Balakrishnan, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

**(M.S.RAMESH J.) (V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN J.)**

**03-06-2025**

nl

Index:Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation:Yes/No



To  
WEB COPY

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary To Government  
Home, Prohibition And Excise Department,  
Secretariat, Chennai-9.
- 2.The District Collector And District Magistrate  
Coimbatore District, Coimbatore.
- 3.The Superintendent Of Police  
Coimbatore District, Coimbatore.
- 4.The Superintendent, Central Prison  
Coimbatore.
- 5.The Inspector Of Police  
Mettupalyam All Women Police Station,  
Coimbatore District.



WEB COPY

HCP No. 553 of 2025



**M.S.RAMESH J.**  
**AND**  
**V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN J.**  
nl

**HCP No. 553 of 2025**



WEB COPY

HCP No. 553 of 2025



03-06-2025