



H.C.P.(MD)No.971 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
WEB COPY

DATED : 19.02.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN
AND
THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R. POORNIMA

H.C.P.(MD)No.971 of 2025

Megarubanu

... Petitioner/
Wife of the Detenu

-VS-

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by Additional Chief Secretary to the Government,
Fort St. George, Chennai-9.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Thanjavur District,
Thanjavur.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Trichy.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
Pattukkottai Police Station,



H.C.P.(MD)No.971 of 2025

Pattukkottai,
Thanjavur District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 22.07.2025 in detention order in P.D.O.No.43/2025 and to quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body of the detenu namely Raja Bakhrutheen, S/o.Naina Mohammed, aged about 42 years before this Court and set him at liberty, now detained at Central Prison, Trichy.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Rameshkumar

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 wife of the detenu viz., Raja Bakhrutheen, son of Nainamohamed, aged about 42 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by her order in P.D.No.43/2025, dated 22.07.2025 holding him to be a "Goonda", as




H.C.P.(MD)No.971 of 2025

WEB COPY

contemplated under Section 2(f) 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. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner raised the grounds that the detenu was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 20.06.2025 in pursuant to the registration of the FIR in Cr.No.406 of 2025 for the offence under Section 24(1) of Cigarette and other Tobacco Products (Prohibition of Advertisement and Regulation of Trade and Commerce Production, Supply and Distribution) Act, 2003. It was shown as ground case. However, the detention order was passed only on 22.07.2025 after a period of 32 days. This inordinate delay in passing the detention order would



H.C.P.(MD)No.971 of 2025

WEB COPY

vitate 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. On a perusal of the counter affidavit and also the submission made by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents reveals that, the detenu was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 20.06.2025. However, the detenu was detained under Act, 14 of 1982 only on 22.07.2025. 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 detention has snapped. Thus, on this sole ground alone, the impugned order of detention is liable to be set aside.



H.C.P.(MD)No.971 of 2025

WEB COPY

5. 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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.971 of 2025

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.”

6. 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.

7. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in P.D.No.43/2025, dated 22.07.2025, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Raja




H.C.P.(MD)No.971 of 2025

WEB COPY

Bakhrutheen, son of Nainamohamed, aged about 42 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[G.K.I., J.] [R.P., J.]
19.02.2026

am
NCC :Yes/No
Index: Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No



H.C.P.(MD)No.971 of 2025

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to the Government,
Fort St. George,
Chennai-9.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Thanjavur District,
Thanjavur.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Trichy.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
Pattukkottai Police Station,
Pattukkottai,
Thanjavur District.
- 5.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.971 of 2025

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

am

H.C.P.(MD)No.971 of 2025

19.02.2026