



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.170 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 17.07.2023

Coram

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **M.SUNDAR**
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **R.SAKTHIVEL**

H.C.P.No.170 of 2023

Gobi

.. Petitioner

VS

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate / District Collector
Master Plan Complex
Collector's Office
Thiruvallur District
Thiruvallur
3. The Superintendent of Police
Thiruvallur District
Thiruvallur
4. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison-II
Puzhal, Chennai
5. The Inspector of Police
F2, Sipcot Police Station
Thiruvallur District

.. Respondents



H.C.P.No.170 of 2023

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus calling the respondents to produce the records of detention order bearing reference B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V No.64/2022 against the detenu passed by the second respondent herein by an order dated 05.12.2022 and quash the same and produce the petitioner's son Saran, son of Kovilan, aged 23 years, presently confined in Central Prison II, Puzhal and set aside the same and consequently direct the respondents to produce the body of the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.E.V.Chandru

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 06.02.2023, this Court made the following order:

' Captioned Habeas Corpus Petition has been filed in this Court on 27.01.2023 inter alia assailing a detention order dated 05.12.2022 bearing reference BCDFGISSSV No.64/2022 made by 'second respondent' [hereinafter 'Detaining Authority'



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.170 of 2023

for the sake of convenience and clarity]. To be noted, fifth respondent is the Sponsoring Authority.

2. The Mother of the detenu is the petitioner.

3. Mr.E.V.Chandru, 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 341 and 302 IPC in Crime No. 233 of 2022 on the file of Arani Police Station.

4. The aforementioned detention order has been made on the premise that the detenu is a 'Goonda' under Section 2(f) 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 family members of the detenu were not informed about the detention, which prevented them from making an effective representation.

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.'



H.C.P.No.170 of 2023

2. The aforementioned order made in the 06.02.2023 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 one adverse case and one ground case. The ground case which constitutes substantial part of substratum of the impugned preventive detention order is Crime No.233 of 2022 on the file of C3 Arani Police Station for alleged offences under Sections 341 and 302 of IPC. 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.E.V.Chandru, learned counsel representing the 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 date of arrest and remand in the ground case is 24.10.2022 but the impugned detention order has been made only on 05.12.2022.



H.C.P.No.170 of 2023

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, 19170' [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 delay'. We find that the captioned matter falls under latter facet i.e., unexplained delay.



H.C.P.No.170 of 2023

WEB COPY

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.To be noted, one adverse case viz., Crime No.388 of 2021 on the file of F2 Sipcot Police Station for alleged offences *inter-alia* under Section 392 of IPC has become stale.

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

11. Ergo, the sequitur is, captioned HCP is allowed. Impugned detention order dated 05.12.2022 bearing reference



H.C.P.No.170 of 2023

No.B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V No.64 of 2022 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Saran, aged 23 years, son of Thiru.Kovilan, 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.)
17.07.2023

Index : Yes

Neutral Citation : Yes

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



H.C.P.No.170 of 2023

To

WEB COPY

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
2. The District Magistrate / District Collector
Master Plan Complex
Collector's Office
Thiruvallur District
Thiruvallur
3. The Superintendent of Police
Thiruvallur District
Thiruvallur
4. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison-II
Puzhal, Chennai
5. The Inspector of Police
F2, Sipcot Police Station
Thiruvallur District
6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.170 of 2023

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

gpa

H.C.P.No.170 of 2023

17.07.2023