



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.344 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 28.06.2023

Coram

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

H.C.P.No.344 of 2023

Mrs.Rathnamma

.. Petitioner /
Mother of detenu

VS

1.State of Tamil Nadu

Rep. by the Secretary

Home, Prohibition and Excise Department

Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate
Krishnagiri District

3. The Superintendent of Police
Krishnagiri District

4. The Superintendent
Central Prison, Salem

5. The Inspector of Police
Hudco Police Station
Krishnagiri District

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus calling for the records relating to the detention order in SC No.45/2022 dated 14.12.2022 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same



H.C.P.No.344 of 2023

and direct the 4th respondent to produce the detenu, namely Madhan Kumar, son of Narayanappa, the detenu now confined in Central Prison, Cuddalore before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Mohammed Aseef
For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

Captioned 'Habeas Corpus Petition' ['HCP' for the sake of brevity] has been filed by mother of detenu assailing a 'preventive detention order dated 14.12.2022 bearing reference S.C.No.45 of 2022' [hereinafter 'impugned detention order' for the sake of convenience and brevity]. To be noted, fifth respondent is the sponsoring authority and second respondent is the detaining authority as impugned detention order has been made by second respondent.

2. When the captioned HCP was listed for admission before this Court, proceedings/orders dated 07.03.2023 was made in the 'Admission Board' and the same reads as follows:



"Captioned Habeas Corpus Petition has been filed in this Court on 28.02.2023 inter alia assailing a detention order dated 14.12.2022 bearing reference S.C.No.45/2022 made by 'second respondent' [hereinafter 'Detaining Authority' for the sake of convenience and clarity]. To be noted, fifth respondent is the Sponsoring Authority.

2.Mother of the detenu is the petitioner.

3.Ms.Devi Sai Monica, learned counsel representing Mr.G.Mohammed Aseef, 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 Section 302 of 'The Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860)' [hereinafter 'IPC' for the sake of convenience and clarity] in Crime No.294 of 2022 on the file of Hudco 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 live and proximate link between grounds of detention and purpose of detention has snapped.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.344 of 2023

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.'

3. The aforementioned proceedings/orders made in the 'Admission Board' captures short facts essential and imperative for appreciating this order and therefore without setting out the same again, we deem it appropriate to say that aforementioned proceedings shall be read as an integral part and parcel of this order.

4. 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.294 of 2022 on the file of Hudco Police Station for an alleged offence under Section 302 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.

5. Mr. G. Mohammed Aseef, learned counsel on record for



H.C.P.No.344 of 2023

petitioner and Mr.E.Raj Thilak, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor for all respondents are before us.

6. 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 10.10.2022 but the impugned detention order has been made only on 14.12.2022.

7. 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.

8. 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



H.C.P.No.344 of 2023

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.

9. 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.



H.C.P.No.344 of 2023

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 14.12.2022 bearing reference S.C.No.45 of 2022 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Madhan Kumar, aged 24 years, son of Thiru.Narayanappa, 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.)
28.06.2023

Index : Yes

Neutral Citation : Yes

gpa

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



H.C.P.No.344 of 2023

To

WEB COPY

1. The Secretary
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate
Krishnagiri District
3. The Superintendent of Police
Krishnagiri District
4. The Superintendent
Central Prison, Salem
5. The Inspector of Police
Hudco Police Station
Krishnagiri District
6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.344 of 2023

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

gpa

H.C.P.No.344 of 2023

28.06.2023