



HCP No.22 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

**DATED: 30-06-2026**

CORAM

**THE HON'BLE DR.JUSTICE ANITA SUMANTH**

**AND**

**THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN**


**HCP No. 22 of 2026**

Munirathnamma  
W/o. Ravikumar,  
No.4/140-1, Shoolagiri,  
Enusonai, Ullatti Post,  
Krishnagiri District.

...Petitioner/Mother of  
the Detenue

Vs

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,  
The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Secretariat,  
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector and  
District Magistrate,  
Krishnagiri,  
Krishnagiri District.
3. The Superintendent Police,  
Krishnagiri District,  
Krishnagiri.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison,  
Salem District.
5. The Inspector of Police,



HCP No.22 of 2026

Shoolagiri Police Station,  
Krishnagiri District.

WEB COPY

...Respondents

Prayer : Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India praying for issuance of Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records pertaining to the order of detention passed in his proceedings in S.C.No.35/2025 dated 19.10.2025 passed by the 2nd respondent and set aside the same and directing the respondents to produce the petitioner's son by name in Rakshith son of Ravikumar aged about 21 years before this Court now confined in Central Prison, Salem and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner: Mr.K.Prathap

For Respondents: Mr.C.R.Malarvannan  
Counsel for Government of Tamil Nadu  
(Criminal Side)

### **ORDER**

**(Order of the Court was made by Sunder Mohan J.)**

The mother of the detenu – Rakshith, S/o. Ravikumar, aged 21 years, has filed this petition challenging the detention order dated 19.10.2025, branding him as a 'Goonda' under Section 2(f) of the Tamil Nadu Preventive Detention Act, 1982 (Act 14/1982).



2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Counsel for Government of Tamil Nadu (Criminal Side) for the respondents.

3. It is seen from the impugned order and the grounds of detention that the detenu was arrested on 18.09.2025 and he was detained on 19.10.2025. The respondents have not satisfactorily explained the delay in passing the order of detention either in the grounds of detention or in the counter affidavit. We are of the view that in view of the delay, the live and proximate link between grounds of detention and the purpose of detention, is snapped. In this regard, we may rely upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**Sushanta Kumar Banik Vs. State of Tripura**', reported in '**2022 SCC OnLine SC 1333**' and the relevant paragraph reads as follows:

*“21. 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*




WEB COPY

HCP No.22 of 2026

*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.”*

4. 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 the grounds and purpose of detention would stand snapped.

5. 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.



HCP No.22 of 2026

6. In light of the above discussion, this Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the Detention Order passed by the second respondent in S.C.No.35/2025, dated 19.10.2025 is set aside.

7. The detenu, viz., Rakshith, S/o. Ravikumar, aged 21 years, now confined in Central Prison, Salem, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his presence is required in connection with any other case.

(A.S.M.,J.) (S.M.,J.)  
30-06-2026

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

Note: Issue Order copy today.


*dk*



To

WEB COPY

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Secretariat,  
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector and  
District Magistrate,  
Krishnagiri,  
Krishnagiri District.
3. The Superintendent Police,  
Krishnagiri District,  
Krishnagiri.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison,  
Salem District.
5. The Inspector of Police,  
Shoolagiri Police Station,  
Krishnagiri District.
6. The Joint Secretary,  
Law and Order Department,  
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
7. The Public Prosecutor,  
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

HCP No.22 of 2026

**DR.ANITA SUMANTH, J.  
AND  
SUNDER MOHAN, J.**

*dk*

**HCP No. 22 of 2026**

**30-06-2026**