



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.301 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 26.06.2023

Coram

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

H.C.P.No.301 of 2023

S.Venkadachalam

.. Petitioner

VS

1.The State of Tamil Nadu

Rep. By its Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tiruppur City.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison, Coimbatore.

4.The Inspector of Police,
15, Velampalayam Police Station,
Tiruppur.

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India
praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus calling for the
records in connection with the order of detention passed by the
second respondent dated 04.11.2022 in proceeding
C.No.74/G/IS/Tiruppur City/2022 and set aside the same and
produce the body and person of the detenu namely Amaran alias



H.C.P.No.301 of 2023

Bharathiraja, M/20, S/o.(late) Jayachandhiran, now confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore before this Court, set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Ms.A.Veeramarthini
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 01.03.2023, this Court made the following order:

"Captioned Habeas Corpus Petition (for brevity, 'HCP') has been filed in this Court on 16.02.2023 inter-alia assailing a detention order dated 04.11.2022 bearing Reference Number in Proceedings C.No.74/G/IS/Tiruppur City/2022, made by the 'second respondent' (hereinafter called as 'Detaining Authority' for the sake of convenience and clarity). To be noted, fourth respondent is the Sponsoring Authority.

2. The grand father of the detenu is the petitioner.

3. Mrs.A.Veeramarthini, learned counsel on record for habeas corpus petitioner, is before us. Learned counsel



H.C.P.No.301 of 2023

for the petitioner submits that the ground case qua the detenu, is for the alleged offences under Sections 302 and 380 of the Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860) (for short, IPC for the sake of convenience and clarity), in Crime No.497 of 2022 on the file of Velampalayam, Tiruppur.

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 called as 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 Sponsoring Authority had not placed all the documents before the Detaining Authority in the manner known to law, which vitiates the detention order.

6. Prima-facie case made out for admission of the HCP. Accordingly, Admit, Issue Rule Nisi, Call for records, returnable in four weeks.

7. Mr.R.Muniyappa Raj, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, State of Tamil Nadu, High Court, Madras, accepts notice for all the respondents.

8. List the captioned HCP accordingly."

2. The aforementioned order made in the 01.03.2023 Admission listing shall be read as an integral part and parcel of



H.C.P.No.301 of 2023

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. The ground case which is the sole substratum of the impugned detention order is Crime No.497 of 2022 on the file of 15 Velampalayam Police Station for the alleged offences under Sections 302 and 380 of 'The Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860)' [hereinafter 'IPC' for the sake of convenience and clarity]. Owing to the nature of the challenge to the impugned detention order, it is not necessary to delve into the factual matrix or be detained further by facts.

4. Ms.A.Veeramarthini, 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 date of remand in the ground case is 06.08.2022 but the impugned detention order has been made only on 04.11.2022.



H.C.P.No.301 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, 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 delay'. We find that the captioned matter falls under latter facet i.e., unexplained delay.



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. 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 04.11.2022 bearing reference C.No.74/G/IS/Tiruppur City/2022 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Amaran alias Bharathiraja, aged 20 years, son of Thiru.Jayachandhiran, is directed to be set at



H.C.P.No.301 of 2023

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.)
26.06.2023

Index : Yes/No
Neutral Citation : Yes/No
mmi

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

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tiruppur City.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison, Coimbatore.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
15, Velampalayam Police Station,
Tiruppur.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.301 of 2023

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

mmi

H.C.P.No.301 of 2023

26.06.2023