

H.C.P.No.906 of 2025

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 19.06.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

and

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.906 of 2025

Santhi

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamilnadu,
Rep by Its, Secretary to Government Home,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
The Commissioner Office,
Vepery, Chennai – 600 007.

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

4.The Inspector of Police,
G-1, Veppary Police Station,
Chennai District.

.. Respondents

Prayer: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India
praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating



H.C.P.No.906 of 2025

to the detention order in Memo No.52/BCDFGISSSV/2025, dated 01.02.2025 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondent to produce the petitioner's son Kishorekumar @ Kava Kishore the detenue, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set the petitioner's son Kishorekumar @ Kava Kishore, Son of Akasam, Aged about 32 years the detenue herein set him at liberty.

For petitioner : Mr.B.Shankar
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 mother of detenu viz.Kishorekumar @ Kava Kishore, aged about 32 years, S/o.Akasam, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 01.02.2025 slapped on her son, 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].

2.Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the



H.C.P.No.906 of 2025

learned 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 18.12.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 01.02.2025. 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



WEB COPY




H.C.P.No.906 of 2025

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



H.C.P.No.906 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 01.02.2025 in Memo No.52/BCDFGISSSV/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The petitioner's son / detenu viz., Kishorekumar @ Kava Kishore, aged about 32 years, S/o.Akasam, 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)

19.06.2025

krk

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

M.S.RAMESH, J.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.906 of 2025

and

V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

krk

To

- 1.The State of Tamilnadu,
Rep by Its, Secretary to Government Home,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, The Commissioner Office,
Vepery, Chennai – 600 007.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison – Puzhal, Chennai.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
G-1, Veppary Police Station,
Chennai District.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.906 of 2025

19.06.2025