



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1041 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 14.08.2023

CORAM

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

H.C.P.No.1041 of 2023

Vignesh

.. Petitioner

Vs

1.The Government of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. By its Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 9.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Vepery, Chennai – 07.

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai - 66.

4.The Inspector of Police,
F3, Nungambakkam Police Station,
Chennai – 34.

.. 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 proceedings of the 2nd respondent in BCDFGISSSV No.477/2022 dated 20.12.2022 against the petitioner's brother Dinesh @ Beedi Dinesh, male, aged about 24 years, S/o.Palani, and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the detenu who is detained under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 currently confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Surendran

Page Nos.1/8



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1041 of 2023

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 the brother of the detenu assailing a 'preventive detention order dated 20.12.2022 bearing reference No.477/BCDFGISSSV/2022' [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, fourth 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, 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]



H.C.P.No.1041 of 2023

on the premise that the detenu is a 'Goonda' within the meaning of Section 2(f) of Act 14 of 1982.

3. There is one adverse case. The ground case which constitutes substantial part of substratum of the impugned preventive detention order is Crime No.321 of 2022 on the file of F-3 Nungambakkam Police Station for alleged offences under Sections 341, 294(b), 353, 336, 427, 307 and 506(ii) of 'The Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860)' [hereinafter 'IPC' for the sake of convenience and clarity] subsequently altered into one under Sections 341, 294(b), 353, 336, 427, 307 and 506(ii) of IPC, Section 4 of Explosive Substances Act, 1908, Section 25(1)(A) of Arms Act and Section 8(c) r/w 20(b)(ii)(B) of Narcotic Drugs 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.Surendran, 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.1041 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 02.11.2022 but the impugned preventive detention order has been made only on 20.12.2022.

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



H.C.P.No.1041 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.1041 of 2023

WEB COPY

9. The adverse case cited in the grounds of impugned preventive detention order pertains to the year 2022 (date of occurrence 14.03.2022) and therefore time consumed remains unexplained.

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 20.12.2022 bearing reference No.477/BCDFGISSSV/2022 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Dinesh @ Beedi Dinesh, aged 24 years, Son of Thiru.Palani, 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.)**
14.08.2023

Index : Yes
Neutral Citation : Yes
mmi

Page Nos.6/8



H.C.P.No.1041 of 2023

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

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 9.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Vepery, Chennai – 07.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai - 66.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
F3, Nungambakkam Police Station,
Chennai – 34.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1041 of 2023

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

mmi

H.C.P.No.1041 of 2023

14.08.2023

Page Nos.8/8