WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 03-11-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.KARTHIKEYAN

H.C.P.No.1488 of 2026

Case QR

CNR:{HCMA011884752026}

Nagamani ..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State rep. by its,
   Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
   Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
   Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
   Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
   Coimbatore.

3. The Superintendent of Police,
   Office of the Superintendent of Police,
   Coimbatore.

4. The Superintendent of Prison,
   Central Prison at Coimbatore,
   Gandhipuram, Coimbatore.

5. The Inspector of Police
   Sirumugai Police Station,
   Coimbatore District. ..Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Habeas Corpus Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature of writ calling for the records in Detention order in

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Cr.M.P.No.22/G/2026 dated 19.07.2026 on the file of the 2nd respondent and set aside the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's husband/detenu namely Babu @ Black Babu, S/o.Mohamed Ali, aged 35 years, now confined at the Central Prison at Coimbatore before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner(s): Ms.R.Subadra Devi

For Respondent(s): Mr.M.Mohamed Riyaz,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Made by A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA J.)

The petitioner, who is the wife of the detenu Babu @ Black Babu, male, aged 35 years, son of Mohamed Ali, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent in Cr.M.P.No.22/G/2026, dated 19.07.2026 branding him as a "Goonda" under Section 2(f) of the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].

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.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

3. Though several grounds have been raised in the habeas corpus petition, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would mainly focus her 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 15.06.2026, and the impugned detention order came to be passed only on 19.07.2026, i.e., after a lapse of one month. This inordinate delay in passing the detention order would vitiate the same. She 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 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 further submitted that though there was a delay in passing the impugned detention order, on that score alone, it cannot be quashed. According to the learned Public Prosecutor, no prejudice has been caused to the detenu and therefore, the habeas corpus petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. The detenu was arrested in the ground case as early as on 15.06.2026 and the detention order was passed on 19.07.2026. 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

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

passing the order of detention has snapped. Thus, on this sole ground alone, the impugned order of detention is liable to be set aside.

6. 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 Hon'ble Supreme Court 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*

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

unreasonable and stands unexplained depends on the facts and circumstances of each case."

7. In view of the above, as pointed out by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the delay has not been attempted to be explained, thereby vitiating and invalidating the detention order.

8. In the result, this Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Cr.M.P.No.22/G/2026, dated 19.07.2026, passed by the second respondent, is set aside. The detenu, viz., Babu @ Black Babu, son of Mohamed Ali, aged about 35 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

(A.D.J.C.,J.) (B.K.,J.)
03-11-2026

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

ham

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Coimbatore.

3. The Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Superintendent of Police,
Coimbatore.

4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison at Coimbatore,
Gandhipuram, Coimbatore.

5. The Inspector of Police
Sirumugai Police Station,
Coimbatore District.

6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA J.
AND
B.KARTHIKEYAN J.

ham

H.C.P.No.1488 of 2026

03-11-2026

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis