



H.C.P.(MD)No.1093 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 11.12.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN

AND

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE N.MALA

H.C.P.(MD)No.1093 of 2025

Asha

... Petitioner/Mother of the Detenu

-VS-

1.State of Tamilnadu through,
The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.

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

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Trichy.

... Respondents



H.C.P.(MD)No.1093 of 2025

WEB COPY

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the Detention Order passed by the second respondent in his proceedings Cr.M.P.No.27/2025 detention order dated 29.04.2025 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the person or body of the detenu namely Sakthivel, S/o.Burgili Murugan alias Murugan, aged 23 years (now detained at Central Prison, Trichy) before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Ananda Kumar

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 mother of the detenu viz., Sakthivel, son of Burgili Murugan, aged about 23 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Cr.M.P.No.27/2025, dated 29.04.2025 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.



H.C.P.(MD)No.1093 of 2025

WEB COPY

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.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner raised the grounds that the detenu was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 19.03.2025 in pursuant to the registration of the FIR in Cr.No.49 of 2025 for the offence punishable under Sections 8(c) r/w 20(b)(ii)(C) of NDPS Act. But the detenut was detained under Goondas Act 14 of 1982 on 29.04.2025 after 40 days from the date of arrest. The detaining authority has referred only one ground case and there is no adverse case as against the detenu. 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.



H.C.P.(MD)No.1093 of 2025

WEB COPY

4. On a perusal of the counter affidavit and also the submission made by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents reveals that there is no explanation for the delay of 40 days in passing the detention order. 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.

5. 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 requisite satisfaction of the detaining authority in passing the detention order unless such delay is satisfactorily explained and consequently



H.C.P.(MD)No.1093 of 2025

WEB COPY

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."

6. 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.



H.C.P.(MD)No.1093 of 2025

WEB COPY

7. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Cr.M.P.No.27/2025, dated 29.04.2025, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Sakthivel, son of Burgili Murugan alias Murgan, aged about 23 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[G.K.I., J.] [N.M., J.]

11.12.2025

am

NCC :Yes/No

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tiruchirappalli.
Tiruchirappalli.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Trichy.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.1093 of 2025

G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN,J.
AND
N.MALA,J.

am

H.C.P.(MD)No.1093 of 2025

11.12.2025