



WEB COPY

HCP No. 163 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 02-07-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE DR.JUSTICE ANITA SUMANTH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

HCP No. 163 of 2026

Ganga
Wife of Kuppudoss,
NO.2/5, Palani Amman Kovi 6th Street,
Mattankuppam,
Triplicane,
Chennai - 600 005.


..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. State of Tamil Nadu, represented by
The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Department of Home, Prohibition and Excise,
Secretariat, Fort St.George,
Chennai.
2. The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai,
Office of Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai - 7.
3. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison-Puzhal-II,
Puzhal, Chennai.
4. The Inspector of Police
D-6, Anna Square Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent(s)

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to
issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus or any other writ order or detention in the nature



of the Writ calling for the records in Memo No.764/BBCDEFGISSSV/2025 passed by the 2nd respondent on 07.10.2025, on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondent to produce petitioner son Praveen Alias Kaipulla, Son of Kuppudoss, aged about 31 years before this Honble Court, who is now detained in Central Prison, Puzhal-II, and set him at liberty and pass such other orders as this Honble Court.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.A.Elumalai

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


Order

(Order of the Court was made by Dr.Anita Sumanth J.)

The mother of one Praveen @ Kaipulla (detenu), S/o. Kuppudoss, who was detained as a 'Drug Offender' under Section 2(e) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 (in short 'Act') has approached this Court challenging the order of detention dated 07.10.2025.

2. We have heard Mr.A.Elumalai, learned counsel for petitioner and Mr.C.R.Malarvannan, 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 30.08.2025 and he was detained on 07.10.2025. We do not find any satisfactory explanation for the delay in passing the order of detention either in the grounds of detention or in the counter affidavit filed by



the 2nd respondent. Hence, we are of the view that the live and proximate link between grounds of detention and the purpose of detention stands snapped.


WEB COPY

4. In *Sushanta Kumar Banik Vs. State of Tripura* (2022 LiveLaw (SC) 813), a similar issue arose, and the relevant discussion 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.”

5. 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* (2023 SCC OnLine Mad 6332), had held that when there is an inordinate delay between the date of arrest/date of proposal and the order of detention, the live and proximate link between them would also stand snapped and thereby, had quashed the detention order on this ground.

6. In yet another case i.e., in *Nagaraj Vs. State of Tamil Nadu*, ((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. In the present case, the delay is more than a month, 38 days to be exact, and unexplained and for this reason, vitiates the order, rendering it liable to be quashed.

7. In light of the aforesaid discussion, we are of the considered view that there is neither a proximate link between the arrest (30.08.2025) and order of detention (07.10.2025), and nor is there any credible material brought on record by the detaining authority to substantiate his subjective satisfaction.

8. Hence, this Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the Detention Order passed by the second respondent in No.764/BBCDEFGISSSV/2025 dated 07.10.2025 is set aside.


9. The detenu, viz., Praveen @ Kaipulla, S/o. Kuppudoss, male aged 31 years, confined in Central Prison, Puzhal - II, 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
Neutral Citation: Yes

dp

Note to Registry : Issue Today



To

1. State of Tamil Nadu, represented by
The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Department of Home, Prohibition and Excise,
Secretariat, Fort St.George,
Chennai.
2. The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai,
Office of Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai – 7.
3. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai.
4. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison-Puzhal-II,
Puzhal, Chennai.
5. The Inspector of Police
D-6, Anna Square Police Station,
Chennai.
6. The Joint Secretary to Government
Public (Law and Order),
Fort St.George, Chennai – 9.
7. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

HCP No. 163 of 2



DR.ANITA SUMANTH J.
AND
SUNDER MOHAN J.

DP

HCP No. 163 of 2026

02-07-2026