



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1027 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 08.07.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.1027 of 2025

Ponraj

Petitioner(s) /father of the detenue

Vs

1. The State Represented By Its, The
Additional Chief Secretary to
Government (home),
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Government of Tamil Nadu, Fort
St.George, Chennai 600 009.

2. The Commissioner of Police
Detaining Authority, Office of the
Commissioner of Police, Chennai
City.

3. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison -II, Puzhal, Chennai.

4. The Inspector of Police
J8, Neelankarai Police Station,
Chennai.

Respondent(s)



HCP.No.1027 of 2025

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 order of detention dated 24.03.2025 passed by the respondent in C.No. 168/BCDFGISSSV/2025 and quash the same and produce the detenu Mahesh Kumar, S/o.Ponraj, aged about 24 years, before this court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Mario Johnson
For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the father of the detenu, Mahesh Kumar, S/o.Ponraj, aged about 24 years, now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 24.03.2025 issued against his son, 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].



HCP.No.1027 of 2025

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 thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 24.03.2025. 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:-



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1027 of 2025

“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.



HCP.No.1027 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 C.No. 168/BCDFGISSSV/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Mahesh Kumar, S/o.Ponraj, aged about 24 years, now confined 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] [V.L.N., J]
08.07.2025

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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1027 of 2025

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

To

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to
Government (home),
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Government of Tamil Nadu, Fort
St.George, Chennai 600 009.

2.The Commisssioner of Police
Detaining Authority, Office of the
Commissioner of Police, Chennai
City.

3.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison -II, Puzhal, Chennai.

4.The Inspector of Police
J8, Neelankarai Police Station,
Chennai.

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

6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.1027 of 2025

08.07.2025