WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 02-11-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M. NIRMAL KUMAR

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.GUNASEKARAN

HCP(MD) No. 1031 of 2026

CNR:{HCMD011076772026}

Case QR

Thamim Ansari
S/o. Abbash Manthiri,
Door No. 5/330,
Seethalakshmi Nagar,
Othakadai,
Madurai East Taluk,
Madurai District.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. State of Tamil Nadu Rep. By its
   Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
   Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
   State of Tamilnadu,
   Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
   Secretariat,
   Chennai-600009.

2. The State of Tamilnadu rep. by THE DISTRICT
   COLLECTOR AND DISTRICT MAGISTRATE
   Madurai District.

3. The Superintendent Of Prison
   Madurai Central Prison,
   Madurai District.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER: This Petition filed under section TN Act 14 of 82 H2-DO. To issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, Calling for the entire records, connected with the detention order R-2 in Detention Order. BBCDEFGISSSV/

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

WEB COPY

No.44/2026 dated 16.07.2026 and Quash the same and to direct the respondents to produce detenu Thamim Ansari, son of Abbash Manthiri Rajesh aged about 24 years now confining as 'Drug Offender' at Madurai Central Prison before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner(s) :M/s Karthick T
For Respondent(s) :Mr.G.Karuppasamy Pandiyan
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by N.GUNASEKARAN., J.)

The petitioner is the detenu viz., Thamim Ansari, son of Abbash Manthiri Rajesh aged about 24 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in BBCDEFGISSSV/ No.44/2026 dated 16.07.2026 holding him to be a 'Drug Offender', as contemplated under Section 2(e) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this habeas corpus petition.

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.

3. Though several grounds have been raised in the habeas corpus petition, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would mainly focus his arguments on the ground that there is an inordinate delay between the arrest of the detenu and passing the

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

WEB COPY

impugned detention order. In this case, the detenu was arrested on 17.06.2026, and the impugned detention order came to be passed only on 16.07.2026, i.e., after a lapse of 29 days. This inordinate delay in passing the detention order would vitiate the same. He 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 also 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 would submit that though there was a delay in passing the impugned detention order, on that score alone, it cannot be quashed. According to the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, no prejudice has been caused to the detenu and therefore prays for dismissal of the habeas corpus petition.

5. The detenu was arrested in the ground case as early as on 17.06.2026 and the detention order was passed on 16.07.2026. 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 passing the order of detention has snapped. Thus, on this sole ground alone, the impugned order of detention is liable to be set aside.

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

WEB COPY

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 Honourable Supreme Court has 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 unreasonable and stands*

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

WEB COPY

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

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

8. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention inBBCDEFGISSSV/ No.44/2026 dated 16.07.2026, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Thamim Ansari, son of Abbash Manthiri Rajesh aged about 24 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

(M.N.K.,J.) (N.G.N.,J.)
02-11-2026

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

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

WEB COPY

To

1. State of Tamil Nadu Rep. By its
   Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
   Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
   State of Tamilnadu,
   Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
   Secretariat,
   Chennai-600009.

2. The State of Tamilnadu rep. by THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR AND DISTRICT MAGISTRATE
   Madurai District.

3. The Superintendent Of Prison
   Madurai Central Prison,
   Madurai District.

4. The Additional Public Prosecutor
   Madurai Bench of Madras High Court
   Madurai

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

WEB COPY

M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.
AND
N.GUNASEKARAN, J.
CM

HCP(MD) No. 1031 of 2026

02-11-2026

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