



H.C.P.No.611 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 11.06.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.611 of 2025

Mamoni Khutun

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise (XVI) Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.


2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Special Prison for Women, Puzhal,
Chennai District.

4.The Inspector of Police,
F-2, Egmore Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records connected with the detention order in No.48/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 28.01.2025 on the file of the second respondent and quash the same and direct the respondents



H.C.P.No.611 of 2025

to produce the body and person of petitioner's cousin namely Fathima Begum, aged about 24 years, D/o.Ismail Sheik, now confined at Special Prison for Women, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set her at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Muthamizh Selvakumar

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 cousin of the detenue namely Fathima Begum, aged about 24 years, D/o.Ismail Sheik, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 28.01.2025 issued against her cousin, branding her 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



H.C.P.No.611 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 16.12.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 28.01.2025. 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 decisions of this Court, that the underlying principle is



H.C.P.No.611 of 2025

WEB COPY

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



H.C.P.No.611 of 2025

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 detenue, the detention order in the present case, is liable to be quashed.

8. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 28.01.2025 in No.48/BCDFGISSSV/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenue viz., Fathima Begum, aged about 24 years, D/o.Ismail Sheik, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless her confinement is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R, J.]

[V.L.N, J.]

11.06.2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking order/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Sni



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.611 of 2025

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

Sni

To

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise (XVI) Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Special Prison for Women, Puzhal,
Chennai District.

4.The Inspector of Police,
F-2, Egmore Police Station,
Chennai.

5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

6.The Joint Secretary, Public (Law & Order),
Chennai – 600 009.

H.C.P.No.611 of 2025

11.06.2025