



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.875 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 12.09.2023

CORAM

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

H.C.P.No.875 of 2023

Shabudeen

.. Petitioner

Vs

- 1.State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. By its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 9.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Kancheepuram District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Kancheepuram District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai - 66.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Cyber Crime Police Station,
Kancheepuram 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 records relating to the petitioner's son detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order dated 09.03.2023 on the file of the second respondent herein and made in proceedings Rc.No.49/2023/M6-

Page Nos.1/8



H.C.P.No.875 of 2023

D.O.No.07/2023 and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's son namely Vagith, son of Shabudeen, aged about 25 years, before this Court and set the petitioner's son at liberty from detention, where the petitioner's son detained in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

For Petitioner : Mr.J.Ranjith Kumar
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 father of the detenu assailing a 'preventive detention order dated 09.03.2023 bearing reference Rc.No.49/2023/M6-D.O. No.07/2023' [hereinafter 'impugned preventive detention order' for the sake of convenience and brevity] made by second respondent (hereinafter 'detaining authority' for the sake of convenience). To be noted, fifth respondent is the sponsoring authority.

2. Impugned preventive detention order has been made under 'The Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber law offenders, Drug-offenders, Forest-offenders, Goondas,



H.C.P.No.875 of 2023

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] on the premise that the detenu is a 'Cyber Law Offender' within the meaning of Section 2(bb) of Act 14 of 1982.

3. There is no adverse case. The ground case which is the sole substratum of the impugned preventive detention order is Crime No.15 of 2022 on the file of Cyber Crime Police Station Kancheepuram for alleged offences under Sections 420, 506(i) of 'The Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860)' [hereinafter 'IPC' for the sake of convenience and clarity] r/w 66C, 66D, 67A of 'The Information Technology Act, 2000' (hereinafter 'IT Act' for the sake of brevity). 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.J.Ranjith Kumar, learned counsel on record for petitioner and Mr.E.Raj Thilak, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor for all respondents are before us.



H.C.P.No.875 of 2023

WEB COPY

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 in the ground case is 04.02.2023 but the impugned preventive detention order has been made only on 09.03.2023.

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



H.C.P.No.875 of 2023

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.

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.



H.C.P.No.875 of 2023

9. To be noted, the sole substratum of the impugned preventive detention order is a solitary case viz., Crime No.15 of 2022 on the file of Cyber Crime Police Station Kancheepuram for alleged offences inter-alia under Sections 420, 506(i) IPC and Sections 66C, 66D, 67A of IT Act.

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 preventive detention order dated 09.03.2023 bearing reference Rc.No.49/2023/M6-D.O.No.07/2023 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Vagith, aged 25 years, Son of Thiru.Shabudeen, 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.)
12.09.2023

Index : Yes
Neutral Citation : Yes
mmi

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

Page Nos.6/8



H.C.P.No.875 of 2023

To

WEB COPY

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 9.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Kancheepuram District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Kancheepuram District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai - 66.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Cyber Crime Police Station,
Kancheepuram District.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.875 of 2023

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

mmi

H.C.P.No.875 of 2023

12.09.2023

Page Nos.8/8