



WEB COPY



HCP.No.981 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 18.07.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.981 of 2025

Vijayalakshmi

Petitioner(s) /mother of the detenue

Vs

1. The Government of Tamil Nadu
rep.by its
Additional Chief Secretary to
Government, Home, Prohibition and
Excise Department, Secretariat,
Chennai 600 009

2.The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai, Vepery, Chennai-08

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

4.Inspector of Police
L and O, E-3 Teynampet Police
Station, Chennai.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to



HCP.No.981 of 2025

issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for records relating to the proceedings of the 2nd respondent in B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.V.No.193/2025 dated 15.04.2025 against the petitioner's son Vignesh @ Vicky @ Harikrishnan, aged about 31, S/o. Pandiyan@Gandiban and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the detenue who is detained under the Tamil Nadu Act 14/1982 currently confined the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Pandian

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, Vignesh @ Vicky @ Harikrishnan, aged about 31, S/o.Pandiyan@Gandiban, detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 15.04.2025 issued against her son, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law



HCP.No.981 of 2025


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 15.03.2025 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 15.04.2025. 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.981 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.

8. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 15.04.2025 in B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V.No.193/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Vignesh @ Vicky @ Harikrishnan, aged about 31, S/o.Pandiyan@Gandiban, detained at Central



HCP.No.981 of 2025

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

WEB COPY

[M.S.R., J] [V.L.N., J]
18.07.2025

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

To


1. The Government of Tamil Nadu
rep.by its
Additional Chief Secretary to
Government, Home, Prohibition and
Excise Department, Secretariat,
Chennai 600 009

2.The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai, Vepery, Chennai-08

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

4.Inspector of Police
L and O, E-3 Teynampet Police
Station, Chennai.

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



HCP.No.981 of 2025

6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

WEB COPY

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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.981 of 2025

H.C.P.No.981 of 2025

18.07.2025