



WEB COPY

HCP No. 1345 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 08-10-2025

CORAM

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

H.C.P No. 1345 of 2025

1. Vimala

W/o.Santhakumar, No.62,
BRN Garden,Broadway,
Chennai-600 001

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. Home, Prohibition and Excise
Department
Home, Prohibition and Excise
Department, Government of Tamilnadu,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009

2.Commissioner of Police
Office of Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai Police,
Chennai-600 007

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



4.The Inspector of Police
G-5, Secretariate Colony Police Station,
Chennai

WEB COPY

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

The Habeas Corpus Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records of the 2nd respondent in connection with order made No.306/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 04.06.2025 passed against the petitioners son Sarathkumar aged 30 years S/o.Santhakumar, who is confined at Central prison, Puzhal, Chennai, and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Honble Court set him at liberty.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. N.Lokesh

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

ORDER

J.NISHA BANU J.

and

S.SOUNTHAR J.

The petitioner, who is the mother of the detenu viz., Sarathkumar, S/o.Santhakumar, aged about 30 years, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 04.06.2025 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].



WEB COPY

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 01.05.2025 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 04.06.2025. 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




WEB COPY

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 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 04.06.2025 in No.306/BCDFGISSSV/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is **allowed**. The detenu viz., **Sarathkumar, S/o.Santhakumar** aged about 30 years, 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.

(J.NISHA BANU J.) (S.SOUNTHAR J.)
08-10-2025

ASI

To

1.Home, Prohibition and Excise
Department
Home, Prohibition and Excise
Department, Government of Tamilnadu,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009

2.Commissioner of Police
Office of Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai Police,
Chennai-600 007



HCP No. 1345 of 2025



WEB COPY

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

4.The Inspector of Police
G-5, Secretariate Colony Police station,
Chennai.

5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras, Chennai.



WEB COPY

HCP No. 1345 of 2025



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

ASI

H.C.P No. 1345 of 2025

08-10-2025