



WEB COPY



HCP.No.3218 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 16.06.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.3218 of 2024

ESTHER

Petitioner(s) /wife of the detenue

Vs

1. The Secretary To The Government
Home, Prohibition And Excise XVI
Department Secretariat,
Chennai 600 009

2.The Commissioner Of Police,
Greater Chennai

3.The Superintendent Of Prison
Central Prison Puzhal, Chennai
District.

4.The Inspector Of Police
P-6 Kodungaiyur Police Station,
Chennai.

Respondent(s)



HCP.No.3218 of 2024

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records connected with the detention order in BCDFGISSSV.No.1103/2024 dated 05.11.2024 on the file of the Respondent to produce of petitioner's husband one named Mr.Saravanan @ FZ Saravanan s/o.Palani aged about 30 years, now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal and produce detenu before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.


For Petitioner : Mr.Ilayaraja Kandasamy

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the wife of the detenu, Saravanan @ FZ Saravanan s/o.Palani aged about 30 years, now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 05.11.2024 issued against her



HCP.No.3218 of 2024

husband, 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.

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 23.09.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 05.11.2024. 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:-

“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.”



HCP.No.3218 of 2024

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 05.11.2024 in BCDFGISSSV.No.1103/2024, is hereby set aside and the

Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Saravanan @ FZ



HCP.No.3218 of 2024

Saravanan s/o.Palani aged about 30 years, now 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]
16.06.2025

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

To

1. The Secretary To The Government
Home, Prohibition And Excise XVI
Department Secretariat,
Chennai 600 009

2.The Commissioner Of Police,
Greater Chennai

3.The Superintendent Of Prison
Central Prison Puzhal, Chennai
District.

4.The Inspector Of Police
P-6 Kodungaiyur Police Station,
Chennai.

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



HCP.No.3218 of 2024

6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

WEB COPY



WEB COPY



HCP.No.3218 of 2024

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

H.C.P.No.3218 of 2024

16.06.2025