



H.C.P.No.3259 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 11.03.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N. SENTHILKUMAR

H.C.P.No.3259 of 2024

Gomathi

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009.

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

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai – 600 066.

4.State rep. by,
The Inspector of Police,
P-6 Kodungaiyur Police Station,
Chennai – 600 108.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to
issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the



H.C.P.No.3259 of 2024

detention order passed by the 2nd respondent in No.1210/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 10.12.2024 against the petitioner's husband branding him as Drug Offender and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's husband namely Mayakannan @ Kannan, S/o.Azhagarsamy, aged 46 years, now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Nirmal Kumar
For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj,
Additional Public Prosecutor
assisted by Mr.M.Sylvester John

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the wife of the detenu namely Mayakannan @ Kannan, aged about 46 years, S/o.Azhagarsamy, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 10.12.2024 slapped on her 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].



H.C.P.No.3259 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 08.11.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 10.12.2024. 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:-



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.



H.C.P.No.3259 of 2024

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 10.12.2024 in No.1210/BCDFGISSSV/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Mayakannan @ Kannan, aged about 46 years, S/o.Azhagarsamy, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R, J.]

[N.S, J.]

11.03.2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking order/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Sni



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.3259 of 2024

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
N. SENTHILKUMAR, J.

Sni

To

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009.

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

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.

4.The Inspector of Police,
P-6 Kodungaiyur Police Station, Chennai – 600 108.

5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

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

H.C.P.No.3259 of 2024

11.03.2025