



WEB COPY



HCP.No.647 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 03.07.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.647 of 2025

MANOHARI

Petitioner(s) /mother of the detenue

Vs


1. The Principal Secretary To The
Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise
Department, Secretariat, Chennai-600
009.

2. The Commissioner Of Police,
Avadi City.

3. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

4. The Inspector Of Police,
T-9, Pattabiram Police Station, Avadi
City, Chennai.

Respondent(s)



HCP.No.647 of 2025

WEB COPY

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records in Memo No.32/BCDFGISSSV/2025 on the file of the 2nd respondent, quash the detention order dated 24.02.2025 and direct the production of the detenu Murugan, son of Ramesh, presently detained at the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai as a Goonda under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 before this Honble Court and set him at liberty.


For Petitioner : Mr.A.M.Rahamath Ali

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the mother of the detenu, Murugan, son of Ramesh, now detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 24.02.2025 issued against her son, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of



HCP.No.647 of 2025


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 21.01.2025 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 24.02.2025. 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 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.647 of 2025

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.

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 24.02.2025 in No.32/BCDFGISSSV/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Murugan, son of Ramesh, now detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai,



HCP.No.647 of 2025

is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case.

WEB COPY

[M.S.R., J]

[V.L.N., J]

03.07.2025

(10/13)

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Anu

To

1. The Principal Secretary To The
Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise
Department, Secretariat, Chennai-600
009.

2. The Commissioner Of Police,
Avadi City.

3. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

4. The Inspector Of Police,
T-9, Pattabiram Police Station, Avadi
City, Chennai.



HCP.No.647 of 2025

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

WEB COPY

6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and



WEB COPY



HCP.No.647 of 2025

V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

H.C.P.No.647 of 2025

03.07.2025

(10/13)