

HCP NO. 784 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 04-07-2025

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.NO. 784 of 2025

C.Thenmozhi Kannamma Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State of Tamil Nadu Rep.by its
Secretary to the Government, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Chennai City, Chennai-600 007.

3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison Puzhal, Chennai-600 066.

4. The Inspector of Police,
J-8 Neelankarai Police Station, Chennai-600 115. 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 pertaining to the Memo No.169/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 24.03.2025 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein and set aside the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's husband Chinrasu, son of Gopi, aged 25 years, now confined in the Central Prison, Chennai before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.Charles Kamalesh M. Appaji



For Respondent(s): Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor



ORDER

WEB COPY

M.S.RAMESH, J.


AND

V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

The petitioner herein, who is the wife of detenu viz. Chinrasu, aged about 25 years, S/o.Gopi, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 24.03.2025 slapped on 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 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 14.02.2025 and therea

detention order came to be passed on 24.03.2025. This fact is not disputed by the

learned Additional Public Prosecutor.

WEB COPY

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 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 24.03.2025 in BCDFGISSSV No.169/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz. Chinrasu, male, aged about 25 years, S/o.Gopi, confined at



Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, with
confinement is required in connection with any other case.



WEB COPY

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

04-07-2025

kas

Index: Yes / No

Neutral Citation

Speaking / Non Speaking

To

1.The Secretary to the Government, Prohibition and Excise
Department, Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Chennai City, Chennai-600 007.

3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison Puzhal, Chennai-600 066.

4. The Inspector of Police,
J-8 Neelankarai Police Station, Chennai-600 115.

5.The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras
Chennai 600 104



WEB COPY

M.S.RAMESH

A

V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.



kas

H.C.P NO. 784 of 2025

04.07.2025