



WEB COPY



HCP No.105 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 30.06.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.SUNDAR
and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SAKTHIVEL

H.C.P.No.105 of 2023

Rudra

W/o.Karthick Raja

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Secretary to Government
Home Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat
Chennai-600 009.
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector
Tiruvallur District
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector
Tiruvallur District
Master Plan Complex
Tiruvallur Town and District
3. The Superintendent of Police
Gummidipoondi Sub-Division
Tiruvallur District
4. The Superintendent of Prisons
Central Prison – II, Puzhal
Chennai – 66
5. The Inspector of Police



HCP No.105 of 2023

F-3, Arumbakkam Police Station
Tiruvallur District

..Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus to call for the entire records of detention order B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V No.65 of 2022 dated 15.12.2022 issued by the second respondent herein and set aside the same as illegal and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's husband B.Karthick Raja, aged 29 years detained illegally by second respondent before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Thiagarajan
For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by M.SUNDAR, J.,]

When the captioned 'Habeas Corpus Petition' [hereinafter 'HCP' for the sake of convenience and clarity] was listed in the Admission Board on 24.01.2023, this Court made the following order:

'Captioned Habeas Corpus Petition has been filed in this Court on 11.01.2023 inter alia assailing a detention order dated 15.12.2022 bearing reference B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V.No.65/2022 made by 'second respondent' [hereinafter 'Detaining Authority' for the sake of convenience and clarity]. To be noted, fifth respondent is the Sponsoring Authority.



HCP No.105 of 2023

WEB COPY

2. *Wife of the detenu is the petitioner.*

3. *Mr.P.Thiagarajan, learned counsel on record for habeas corpus petitioner is before us. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that ground case qua the detenu is for alleged offences under Sections 8(c), 20(b)(ii)(C), 25, 29(1) of Narcotic Drgus and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 in Crime No.114 of 2022 on the file of Arambakkam Police Station.*

4. *The aforementioned detention order has been made on the premise that the detenu is a 'Drug Offender' under Section 2(e) of 'The Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber law offenders, Drug-offenders, Forest-offenders, Goondas, Immoral traffic offenders, Sand-offenders, Sexual-offenders, Slum-grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamil Nadu Act No.14 of 1982)' [hereinafter 'Act 14 of 1982' for the sake of convenience and clarity].*

5. *The detention order has been assailed inter alia on the ground that the search report prepared at the time of arrest contains no recovery of materials.*

6. *Prima facie case made out for admission. Admit. Issue Rule nisi returnable by four weeks.*

7. *Mr.R.Muniyapparaj, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, State of Tamil Nadu accepts notice for all respondents. List the captioned Habeas Corpus Petition accordingly '*



HCP No.105 of 2023

2. The aforementioned order made in the 24.01.2023 Admission listing shall be read as an integral part and parcel of this order which means that the short forms, short references and abbreviations used in the order in the Admission listing shall be used in the instant order also.

3. There is no adverse case. This solitary case which is the sole substratum of the impugned preventive detention order is Crime No.114 of 2022 on the file of Arumbakkam Police Station for an alleged offence under Sections 8(c), 20(b)(ii)(C), 25, 29(1) of Narcotic Drgus and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985. Owing to the nature of the challenge to the impugned preventive detention order, it is not necessary to delve into the factual matrix or be detained further by facts.

4. Mr.P.Thiagarajan, learned counsel on record for petitioner and Mr.E.Raj Thilak, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor for all respondents are before us.

5. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that 'live and proximate link' between the grounds of detention and purpose of detention has snapped as the date of alleged occurrence is on 28.05.2022, date of remand in the ground



HCP No.105 of 2023

case is 02.10.2022 but the impugned detention order has been made only on 15.12.2022.

6. Mr.E.Raj Thilak, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor, submits to the contrary by saying that materials had to be collected and time was consumed for the same. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and nature of ground case, we find that this explanation of learned State Additional Public Prosecutor is unacceptable.

7. We remind ourselves of **Sushanta Kumar Banik's** case [**Sushanta Kumar Banik Vs. State of Tripura & others reported in 2022 LiveLaw (SC) 813 : 2022 SCC OnLine SC 1333**]. To be noted, **Banik** case law arose under 'Prevention of Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1988' [hereinafter 'PIT NDPS Act' for the sake of brevity] in Tirupura, wherein after considering the proposal by the Sponsoring Authority and after noticing the trajectory the matter took, Hon'ble Supreme Court held that the 'live and proximate link between grounds of detention and purpose of detention snapping' point should be examined on a case to case basis. Hon'ble Supreme Court has held in **Banik** case law that this point has two facets. One facet is 'unreasonable delay' and other facet is 'unexplained



HCP No.105 of 2023

delay'. We find that the captioned matter falls under latter facet i.e., unexplained delay.

8. To be noted, **Banik** case has been respectfully followed by this Court in **Gomathi Vs. The Principal Secretary to Government and others** reported vide Neutral Citation of Madras High Court being **2023/MHC/334**, **Sadik Basha Yusuf Vs. The State of Tamil Nadu and others** reported vide Neutral Citation of Madras High Court being **2023/MHC/733**, **Sangeetha Vs. The Secretary to the Government and others** reported vide Neutral Citation of Madras High Court being **2023:MHC:1110**, **N.Anitha Vs. The Secretary to Government and others** reported vide Neutral Citation of Madras High Court being **2023:MHC:1159** and a series of other orders in HCP cases.

9. Before concluding, we also remind ourselves that preventive detention is not a punishment and HCP is a high prerogative writ.

10. Ergo, the sequitur is, captioned HCP is allowed. Impugned detention order dated 15.12.2022 bearing reference B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V



HCP No.105 of 2023

No.65/2022 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu

Thiru.Karthick Raja, aged 29 years, son of Thiru.Babu, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, if not required in connection with any other case / cases.

There shall be no order as to costs.

(M.S.,J.) (R.S.V.,J.)
30.06.2023

Index : Yes

Speaking order

Neutral Citation : Yes

gpa

P.S: Registry to forthwith communicate this order to Jail authorities in Central Prison II, Puzhal, Chennai.



HCP No.105 of 2023

To

WEB COPY

1. The Secretary to Government
Home Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat
Chennai-600 009.
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector
Tiruvallur District
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector
Tiruvallur District
Master Plan Complex
Tiruvallur Town and District
3. The Superintendent of Police
Gummidipoondi Sub-Division
Tiruvallur District
4. The Superintendent of Police
Central Prison – II, Puzhal
Chennai – 66
5. The Inspector of Police
F-3, Arumbakkam Police Station
Tiruvallur District
6. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP No.105 of 2023

M.SUNDAR, J.,
and
R.SAKTHIVEL, J.,

gpa

H.C.P.No.105 of 2023

30.06.2023