



H.C.P.No.1216 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11-09-2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE J. NISHA BANU

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. SOUNTHAR

H.C.P.No.1216 of 2025

S.Vijayalakshmi
W/o Sigamani


... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. By its Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat Complex, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Office of Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Chennai.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison Puzhal,
Chennai - 600 066
4. The Inspector of Police,
D-2, Triplicane Police Station,
Chennai District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: The Habeas Corpus Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for records relating to the detention order in No.243/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 07.05.2025 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamilnadu Act 14 of 1982 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the



H.C.P.No.1216 of 2025

body and person of the petitioner named Kanchi, detenu, aged 24 years, S/o Sigamani who is presently confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.Santhosh

For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

J.Nisha Banu,J.
and
S.Sounthar,J

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu, viz., Kanchi, aged 24 years, S/o Sigamani, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent in No.243/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 07.05.2025, 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] read with the order issued by the Government in G.O.(D).No.97 Home Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department dated 11.04.2025 under sub section (2) of Section 3 of the said Act.

2. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner



H.C.P.No.1216 of 2025


and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents. We have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would state that the petitioner was arrested on 30.03.2025 and the detention order was passed only on 07.05.2025. Hence, there is a delay in passing the order of detention. Therefore, the detention order is liable to be quashed.

4. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor would also states that the petitioner was arrested on 30.03.2025 and the order of detention was passed only on 07.05.2025 and there is a delay of 7 days in passing the detention order.

5. We have gone through the entire materials placed on record. As seen from the grounds of detention, it is clear that though the detenu was arrested on 30.03.2025, the order of detention came to be passed only on 07.05.2025. There is no satisfactory explanation offered by the Detaining Authority for the delay in passing the order of detention. Hence, the impugned order of detention is liable to be set aside.

6. Further, the issue involved in this petition is squarely covered by the ratio laid down by the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Sushanta Kumar Banik Vs. State of Tripura*, reported in '2022



H.C.P.No.1216 of 2025

LiveLaw (SC) 813. The relevant portion of the said judgment of the

WEB CO 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.”

Therefore, following the aforesaid judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the impugned order passed by the 2nd respondent is liable to be set aside.

7. Accordingly, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the detention order passed by the second respondent respondent in No.243/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 07.05.2025 is hereby set aside. The detenu, viz., Kanchi, S/o Sigamani, aged 24 years, who is



H.C.P.No.1216 of 2025

now confined in the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, is hereby directed
to be set at liberty forthwith unless his presence is required in connection
with any other case.

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

11-09-2025

vsi
To

1. The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat Complex, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Office of Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Chennai.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison Puzhal, Chennai - 600 066
4. The Inspector of Police,
D-2, Triplicane Police Station,
Chennai District.
5. The Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras, Chennai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1216 of 2025

J. NISHA BANU, J.
and
S. SOUNTHAR, J.

vsi

H.C.P.No.1216 of 2025

11-09-2025