



H.C.P.No.2897 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 02.07.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.2897 of 2024

N.Parthasarathy

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
O/o. Commissioner of Police,
(Goondas Section),
Vepery, Chennai – 600 007.

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

4.The Inspector of Police,
J-8, Neelankarai Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondents



H.C.P.No.2897 of 2024

WEB COPY

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records pertaining to the detention order made in BCDFGISSSV No.1099/2024 dated 29.10.2024 issued under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and quashing the same and directing the 2nd respondent to produce the detenu namely Manikandan, aged about 45 years, S/o.Parthasarathy, now detained in the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Prabakaran,
Senior Counsel

For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by *M.S. RAMESH, J.*)

The petitioner herein, who is the father of the detenu namely Manikandan, aged about 45 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 29.10.2024 issued against his son, 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].



H.C.P.No.2897 of 2024

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 22.09.2025 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 29.10.2024. 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:-



H.C.P.No.2897 of 2024

WEB COPY

“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 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.




WEB COPY

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. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents raised an objection stating that in *Sushanta Kumar Banik's case (supra)*, the delay between the date of detention and the arrest requires to be considered on a case to case basis and since the detenu has 32 adverse cases against him, the detention order may not be quashed.

9. It is true that in *Sushanta Kumar Banik's case (supra)*, it was held that whether the delay is unreasonable and stands unexplained, depends upon the facts and circumstances of each case.



H.C.P.No.2897 of 2024

10. In the counter-affidavit filed by the respondents, though they have recorded that the detenu was arrested on 22.09.2024, not a single reason has been assigned as to why there was an inordinate delay of 37 days in passing the order of detention. In the absence of any reasonable explanation, we are not inclined to accept the objections raised by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor.

11. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 29.10.2024 in BCDFGISSSV No.1099/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Manikandan, aged about 45 years, S/o.Parthasarathy, 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.]

02.07.2025

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

Sni



H.C.P.No.2897 of 2024

To
WEB COPY

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
O/o. Commissioner of Police,
(Goondas Section),
Vepery, Chennai – 600 007.

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

4.The Inspector of Police,
J-8, Neelankarai Police Station,
Chennai.

5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

6.The Joint Secretary, Public (Law & Order),
Chennai – 600 009.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2897 of 2024

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

Sni

H.C.P.No.2897 of 2024

02.07.2025