



HCP(MD)No.1342 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 04.06.2025

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA
and
THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA**

HABEAS CORPUS PETITION(MD)No.1342 of 2024

Gowri

... Petitioner

vs.

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


2. The Commissioner of Police,
Trichy City, Trichy.

3. The Inspector of Police,
Palakkarai Police Station,
Trichy City.

4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Trichy.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, call for the records pertaining to the order of detention passed by the second respondent in proceedings C.No.85/Detention/C.P.O/TC/2024 dated 30.07.2024 and quash the same as illegal and produce the detenu namely Pandi @ Veeramuthu,



HCP(MD)No.1342 of 2024

S/o. Venkatesan, aged about 27 years, now he is confined in Central Prison, Trichy, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Lenin Kumar

For Respondents: Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar

Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by **A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.**]

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu viz., Pandi @ Veeramuthu S/o. Venkatesan, aged about 27 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C.No. 85/Detention/C.P.O/TC/2024 dated 30.07.2024 , holding him to be a "Drug Offender", as contemplated under Section 2(e) 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 Detaining Authority.



HCP(MD)No.1342 of 2024

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 13.05.2024, and the impugned detention order came to be passed only on 30.07.2024, i.e., after a lapse of more than two months. 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 apart from the ground case, the petitioner is involved in four adverse cases and thereby there had been a delay in obtaining the copies of those documents.



HCP(MD)No.1342 of 2024

5. In reply, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner

would submit that out of the four adverse cases, three adverse cases pertain to the sponsoring authority's police station and the only one case is from Thillai Nagar Police Station, which comes under the jurisdiction of Judicial Magistrate No.V, Trichy, and that the delay is more than 78 days.

6. The detenu was arrested in the ground case as early as on 13.05.2024 and the detention order was passed on 30.07.2024. 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.

7. 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



HCP(MD)No.1342 of 2024

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 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."



HCP(MD)No.1342 of 2024

WEB COPY

8. 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.


9. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in C.No.85/Detention/C.P.O/TC/2024 dated 30.07.2024, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, Pandi @ Veeramuthu, S/o. Venkatesan, aged about 27 years, is directed to be released forthwith, unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[A.D.J.C., J.] [R.P., J.]
04.06.2025

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

To:

1. The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,



HCP(MD)No.1342 of 2024

Chennai-600 009.

WEB COPY

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Trichy City,
Trichy.

3. The Inspector of Police,
Palakkarai Police Station,
Trichy City.

4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Trichy.

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



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1342 of 2024

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.
AND
R.POORNIMA, J.

bala

ORDER MADE IN
HCP(MD)No.1342 of 2024
DATED : 04.06.2025