



H.C.P.(MD)No.1192 of 2025

WEB COPY

**BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT**

**DATED :09.02.2026**

**CORAM:**

**THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN  
AND  
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.VIJAYAKUMAR**

**H.C.P.(MD)No.1192 of 2025**

Dineshkumar

... Petitioner

-VS-

1.State of Tamil Nadu,  
Rep. by the Additional Chief Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Fort St. George,  
Chennai - 600 009.

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

3.The Superintendent of Prison,  
Tiruchirappalli Central Prison,  
Tiruchirappalli.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of  
India praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the



H.C.P.(MD)No.1192 of 2025

WEB COPY

entire records connected with the detention order of the Respective No.2 in Cr.M.P.No.65 of 2025, dated 17.07.2025 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu by name Sakthivel, son of Arumugam aged about 25 years, now detained as “DRUG OFFENDER” at Trichy Central Prison before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Alagumani  
For Respondents : Mr.T.Senthil Kumar  
Additional Public Prosecutor

### **ORDER**

(Order of the Court was made by **G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN,J.**)

The petitioner is the brother of the detenu viz., Sakthivel, son of Arumugam aged about 25 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in No. Cr.M.P.No.65 of 2025, dated 17.07.2025 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.



*H.C.P.(MD)No.1192 of 2025*

WEB COPY

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 impugned detention order. In this case, the detenu was arrested on 15.06.2025, in pursuant to the registration of FIR in Crime No.167 of 2025 for the offence under the provisions of the NDPS Act alleging that the petitioner was found in possession of 3 Kgs. of Ganja. However, the impugned detention order came to be passed only on 17.07.2025, i.e., after a lapse of one month. This inordinate delay in passing the detention order would vitiate the same. He further submitted that there is no live and proximate link



*H.C.P.(MD)No.1192 of 2025*

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 15.06.2025 and the detention order was passed on 17.07.2025. 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



H.C.P.(MD)No.1192 of 2025

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 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*



H.C.P.(MD)No.1192 of 2025

*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."*

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



H.C.P.(MD)No.1192 of 2025

WEB COPY

and the order of detention in Cr.M.P.No.65/2025 dated 17.07.2025, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Sakthivel, son of Arumugam aged about 25 years is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[G.K.I., J.] [R.V., J.]  
09.02.2026

NCC :Yes/No  
Index: Yes/No  
Internet: Yes/No  
TM  
To

- 1.State of Tamil Nadu,  
Rep. by the Additional Chief Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Fort St. George,  
Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate  
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,  
Tiruchirappalli District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,  
Tiruchirappalli Central Prison,  
Tiruchirappalli.



*H.C.P.(MD)No.1192 of 2025*

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

G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN,J.  
AND  
R.VIJAYAKUMAR,J.

TM

H.C.P.(MD)No.1192 of 2025

09.02.2026