



H.C.P.No.1166 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED : 18.07.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.1166 of 2025

S.Pushpa Devi

Vs.

.. Petitioner

1.The State rep. by
The Secretary to Government (Home)
Prohibition and Excise Department
Government of Tamil Nadu
Fort St. George, Chennai 9

2.The Commissioner of Police
Chennai District
Chennai

3.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal
Chennai

4.The Inspector of Police
J-3 Guindy Police Station
Chennai

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for
issuance of a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the entire records pertaining to the



H.C.P.No.1166 of 2025

order of detention dated 15.04.2025 passed by R2 in No.195/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 15.04.2025 and quash the same and produce the detenu S.Vishnuraj, S/o.Sathiyamuthy, aged about 26 years, before this Court and set him at liberty and the detenu has now been confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

For petitioner : Mr.D.Ashok Kumar
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, S.Vishnuraj, S/o.Sathiyamuthy, aged about 26 years, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd 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 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 and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.



H.C.P.No.1166 of 2025

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




H.C.P.No.1166 of 2025

WEB COPY

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.



H.C.P.No.1166 of 2025

8. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent on

15.04.2025 in No.195/BCDFGISSSV/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., S.Vishnuraj, S/o.Sathiyamuthy, aged about 26 years, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, 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.)

18.07.2025

Index : Yes/No

Neutral Citation : Yes/No

gya



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1166 of 2025

M.S.RAMESH, J.

AND

V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

gya

To
The Secretary to Government (Home)
Prohibition and Excise Department
Government of Tamil Nadu
Fort St. George, Chennai 9

2.The Commissioner of Police
Chennai District
Chennai

3.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal
Chennai

H.C.P.No.1166 of 2025

4.The Inspector of Police
J-3 Guindy Police Station
Chennai

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

6.The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras

18.07.2025