



WEB COPY



HCP No. 2002 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 27-04-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE DR.JUSTICE ANITA SUMANTH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

HCP No. 2002 of 2025

R.Sandhiya

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissionerate,
Greater Chennai,
Chennai District.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai - 600 066.
4. The Inspector of Police,
Law and Order,
P-5, MKB Nagar Police Station,
Chennai - 600 039.

..Respondent(s)



HCP No. 2002 of 2025

WEB COPY

Prayer : Petition is filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India, praying for issuance of Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records in Detention order passed in No.659/BBCDEFGISSSV/2025 dated 09.09.2025 passed by the 2nd respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the detenu namely Arun, male, aged 24, S/o.Murugan, No.12/1, 1st Street, B.V.Colony, Vyasarpadi, Chennai - 600 039 who is now confined in the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set him at liberty.

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| For Petitioner(s): | Mr.D.Ajithkumar |
| For Respondent(s): | Mr. R.Muniyapparaj, Additional Public Prosecutor, Assisted By Mr. M.Sylvester John |

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by Sunder Mohan J.)

The wife of detenu - Arun, S/o.Murugan, aged 24 years, has filed this petition challenging the detention order dated 09.09.2025, branding him as 'Goonda' under Section 2(f) of the Tamil Nadu Preventive Detention Act, 1982 (Act 14/1982).

2.Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondents.



WEB COPY

3. It is seen from the impugned order and the grounds of detention that the detenu was arrested on 04.08.2025 and he was detained on 09.09.2025. Neither in the grounds of detention nor in the counter affidavit filed by the 2nd respondent, any satisfactory explanation has been given for the delay in passing the order of detention. 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, stood 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.”



WEB COPY

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.

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



HCP No. 2002 of 2025

Detention Order No.659/BBCDEFGISSSV/2025, dated 09.09.2025 is set

WEB COPY
aside.

7.The detenu, viz., Arun, S/o.Murugan, aged 24 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.)
27-04-2026


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

Note: Issue Order Today.

Tsg

To

1. The State Of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissionerate,
Greater Chennai,
Chennai District.



HCP No. 2002 of 2025

WEB COPY

3. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai - 600 066.
4. The Inspector of Police,
Law and Order,
P-5, MKB Nagar Police Station,
Chennai - 600 039.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.



WEB COPY



HCP No. 2002 of 2025

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

Tsg

HCP No. 2002 of 2025

27-04-2026

Page 7 of 7