



*HCP(MD)No.599 of 2025*

**BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT**

**DATED : 15.12.2025**

**CORAM:**

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN**

**and**

**THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA**

**HABEAS CORPUS PETITION(MD)No.599 of 2025**

S.Ariyadevi

... Petitioner

vs.

1. State of Tamil Nadu,  
Rep by the Additional Chief Secretary to the Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Secretariat,  
Chennai-600 009.

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,  
Ramanathapuram District,  
Ramanathapuram.

3. The Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison,  
Madurai.

4. The Inspector of Police,  
Thanjavur Medical College Hospital Police Station,  
Thanjavur District.

... Respondents

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



***HCP(MD)No.599 of 2025***

connected with the detention order passed in S.R.No.15/Goonda/2025 dated 24.03.2025 on the file of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu or body of the detenu namely, the petitioner's husband i.e., Thakka @ Sethuraman, aged about 40 years, S/o. Subbuchandran, now detained at the Central Prison, Madurai, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Pragalathan

For Respondents: Mr.T.Senthil Kumar

Additional Public Prosecutor

**ORDER**

[Order of the Court was made by **G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.**]

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Thakka @ Sethuraman, S/o. Subbuchandran aged about 40 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in S.R.No. 15/Goonda/2025, dated 24.03.2025, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.

2. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents. We have also perused the records produced by the



***HCP(MD)No.599 of 2025***

Detaining Authority.

WEB COPY

3. Though several grounds have been raised in the habeas corpus petition, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would mainly focus his arguments on the ground that there is an inordinate delay between the arrest of the detenu and passing the impugned detention order. In this case, the detenu was arrested on 20.02.2025, and the impugned detention order came to be passed only on 24.03.2025, i.e., after a lapse of 32 days. This inordinate delay in passing the detention order would vitiate the same. He further submitted that there is no live and proximate link between the date of arrest and the date of the detention order. Hence, on this ground, the present impugned detention order is also liable to be set aside.

4. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents strongly opposed the habeas corpus petition by filing his counter. He would submit that though there was a delay in passing the impugned detention order, on that score alone, it cannot be quashed. According to the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, no prejudice has



***HCP(MD)No.599 of 2025***

been caused to the detenu and therefore prays for dismissal of the habeas corpus petition.

5. The detenu was arrested in the ground case as early as on 20.02.2025 and the detention order was passed on 24.03.2025. This shows an inordinate delay in passing the detention order, which is also unexplained. The live and proximate link between the arrest of the detenu and the need for passing the order of detention has snapped. Thus, on this sole ground alone, the impugned order of detention is liable to be set aside.

6. In the case of *Sushanta Kumar Banik vs. State of Tripura*, reported in *2022 SCC Online (SC) 1333*, when there was an inordinate delay from the date of proposal till passing of the detention order and likewise, between the date of actual arrest and the date of detention order, the Honourable Supreme Court has held that the live and proximate link, between the grounds and the purpose of detention, stands snapped throwing a considerable doubt on the genuineness of the



**HCP(MD)No.599 of 2025**

requisite satisfaction of the detaining authority in passing the detention

order unless such delay is satisfactorily explained and consequently

making it invalid. The relevant portion 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."*

7. In view of the above, as pointed out by the counsel for the petitioner, the delay has not been satisfactorily explained, thereby vitiating and invalidating the detention order.

8. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in S.R.No.15/Goonda/2025 dated 24.03.2025,



*HCP(MD)No.599 of 2025*

passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu namely, Thakka @ Sethuraman, S/o. Subbuchandran aged about 40 years, is directed to be released forthwith, unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[G.K.I., J.] [R.P., J.]  
15.12.2025

Index : Yes / No  
Neutral Citation : Yes / No  
bala

To:

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to the Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Secretariat,  
Chennai-600 009.

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,  
Ramanathapuram District,  
Ramanathapuram.

3. The Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison,  
Madurai.

4. The Inspector of Police,  
Thanjavur Medical College Hospital Police Station,  
Thanjavur District.



*HCP(MD)No.599 of 2025*

5.The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,  
Madurai.



WEB COPY



*HCP(MD)No.599 of 2025*

**G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.**  
**AND**  
**R.POORNIMA, J.**

bala

**ORDER MADE IN**  
**HCP(MD)No.599 of 2025**  
**DATED : 15.12.2025**