



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

**DATED : 02-07-2026**

CORAM

WEB COPY

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

**AND**

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

**HCP No.1160 of 2026**


B.Rekha  
W/o.Thiru.Parthiban @ Sangu,  
No.2, Brindavanam Street,  
Mangadu,  
Chennai - 600 122.

...Petitioner/Wife of the  
Detenue

Vs

1. The Secretary to Government,  
Government of Tamil Nadu,  
(Home, Prohibition and Excise Department),  
Fort St.George,  
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,  
Greater Chennai Police,  
Vepery,  
Chennai - 600 007.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,  
Puzhal Prison - II,  
Puzhal,  
Chennai - 600 066.
4. The Inspector of Police,  
F3, Nungambakkam Police Station,  
Chennai - 600 034.

...Respondents



Prayer : Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India praying for issuance of Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records connected with the order of detention passed by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent herein in Memo No.750/BBCDEFGISSSV/2025 dated 04.10.2025, quashing the same and directing the respondents herein to produce the body and person of the detenu, Thiru. Parthiban @ Sangu, S/o. Ravi, aged about 33 years now detained in Central Prison - II, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner: M/S.Kanchan Kar

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 wife of the detenu – Parthiban @ Sangu, S/o. Ravi, aged 33 years, has filed this petition challenging the detention order dated 04.10.2025, branding him as a ‘Drug Offender’ under Section 2(e) 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 24.08.2025 and he was detained on 04.10.2025. The respondents have not satisfactorily explained the delay in passing the order of




WEB COPY

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 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.



WEB COPY

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.

6. In light of the above discussion, this Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the Detention Order passed by the second respondent in No.750/BBCDEFGISSSV/2025 dated 04.10.2025 is set aside.

7. The detenu, viz., Parthiban @ Sangu, S/o.Ravi, aged 33 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.)  
02-07-2026

Index: Yes/No  
Speaking/Non-speaking order  
Neutral Citation: Yes/No  
Note: Issue Order copy today.

dk



To

1. The Secretary to Government,  
Government of Tamil Nadu,  
(Home, Prohibition and Excise Department),  
Fort St.George,  
Chennai - 600 009.

2. The Commissioner of Police,  
Greater Chennai Police,  
Vepery,  
Chennai - 600 007.

3. The Superintendent of Prison,  
Puzhal Prison-II,  
Puzhal,  
Chennai - 600 066.

4. The Inspector of Police,  
F3, Nungambakkam Police Station,  
Chennai - 600 034.

5. The Joint Secretary,  
Law and Order Department,  
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.

6. The Public Prosecutor,  
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



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

*dk*

**HCP No. 1160 of 2026**

**02-07-2026**