



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 25-09-2025

WEB COPY

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MRS JUSTICE J. NISHA BANU
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S. SOUNTHAR**

HCP No. 1093 of 2025

1. PADMAVATHI

W/o. Venkatachalam Door No.6B,
Bharathi Road, Telungupalayam Pudur,
Coimbatore District.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

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

2.The Commissioner of Police
Detaining Authority, Coimbatore City,
Coimbatore District.

3.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison Coimbatore,
Coimbatore District.

4.The State rep by
The Inspector of Police
D2 Selvapuram Police Station,
Coimbatore District.

Respondent(s)



PRAYER: Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction, in the nature of a Writ of habeas corpus to call for the entire records, relating to the petitioner's son detention under Tamil nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order, dated 30.05.2025 on the file of the second respondent herein made in proceedings C.No.93/G/IS/2025, quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondent herein to produce the petitioner son namely V. Dhananjeyan S/o. Venkatachalam, aged 35 years before this Honble High Court and set the petitioner son at liberty from detention, now the petitioner son detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore and thus render justice.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.W.Camyles Gandhi

For Respondent(s): Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan,
Additional Public Prosecutor


ORDER

J.NISHA BANU J.

and

S.SOUNTAR J.

The petitioner is mother of detenu viz., V. Dhananjeyan S/o. Venkatachalam, aged 35 years, confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore and she has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 30.05.2025 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.

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 29.04.2025 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 30.05.2025. 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




WEB COPY

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 30.05.2025 in C.No.93/G/ IS/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., V. Dhananjeyan S/o. Venkatachalam, aged 35 years, confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

(J.NISHA BANU J.) (S.SOUNTHAR J.)

25-09-2025

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes

MST

To

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

2.The Commissioner of Police
Detaining Authority, Coimbatore City,
Coimbatore District.

3.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison Coimbatore, Coimbatore
District.

4.The Inspector of Police
D2 Selvapuram Police Station,
Coimbatore District.



WEB COPY

HCP No. 1093 of 2





WEB COPY

HCP No. 1093 of 2



J.NISHA BANU, J.
AND
S.SOUNTHAR, J.

MST

HCP No. 1093 of 2025

25-09-2025