



HCP No. 172 of 2026

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 25-06-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE DR.JUSTICE ANITA SUMANTH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

HCP No. 172 of 2026

Shipan Das
S/o.Sunil Chandra Das,
Basanta Nagar, GP Kakraban,
Kakraban Post, Udaipuram,
South Tripura District, Tripura 799105.

..Petitioner/
Brother of the detenu

Vs

1. The State of TamilNadu, Rep. by its
Secretary to Govt,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai -9.
2. The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai,
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.
3. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai - 600 066.
4. Inspector of Police
Prohibition Enforcement Wing,
Anna Nagar, Chennai.

..Respondent(s)



HCP No. 172 of 2026

WEB COPY

Prayer : Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India praying for issuance of Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records leading to the detention of the Petitioner's brother Dipankar Das Son of Sunil Chandra Das, Male, aged about 31 Years is presently lodged in Central Prison for Puzhal, Puzhal at Chennai and has been detained under Act 14/82 as a Drug Offender vide detention order dated 25.10.2025 made in BBCDEFGISSSV No.842/2025 by the Commissioner of Police, Greater Chennai, Vepery the 2nd respondent herein and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the body and person of the said detenu before this Court and thereafter set him at liberty.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.M.Rajavelu

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

ORDER

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

The brother of the detenu - Dipankar Das. S/o. Sunil Chandra Das, aged about 31 Years, has filed this petition challenging the detention order dated 25.10.2025, branding him as a 'Drug Offender' under Section 2(e) of the Tamil Nadu Preventive Detention Act, 1982 (Act 14/1982).



WEB COPY

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 13.09.2025 and he was detained on 25.10.2025. 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, stood 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

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. 172 of 2026

WEB COPY

6. In light of the above discussion, this Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the Detention Order passed by the second respondent in Detention Order No.842/BBCDEFGISSSV/2025, dated 25.10.2025 is set aside.

7. The detenu, viz., Dipankar Das. S/o. Sunil Chandra Das, aged about 31 Years, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, 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.)
25-06-2026

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

Issue order copy today.

ars



HCP No. 172 of 2026

WEB COPY

To

1. The Secretary to Govt,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai -9.
2. The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai,
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.
3. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai - 600 066.
4. Inspector of Police
Prohibition Enforcement Wing,
Anna Nagar, Chennai.
5. The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP No. 172 of 2026

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

ars

HCP No. 172 of 2026

25-06-2026

Page 7 of 7