



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1512 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.03.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.SUNDAR

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

H.C.P.No.1512 of 2022

Indhira

W/o.Chandran

... Petitioner /Wife of the detenu

Vs.

1. State of Tamilnadu
Rep. By the Additional Chief Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St.George
Chennai – 600 009
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector
of Ranipet District
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate
Ranipet District, Ranipet - 1
3. The Superintendent of Police
Ranipet, Ranipet District
4. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Vellore
Vellore District

Page Nos.1/8



H.C.P.No.1512 of 2022

WEB COPY

5. The Inspector of Police
Arakkonam Taluk Police Station
Ranipet 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 detention order in B3/D.O.No.35/2022 dated 14.07.2022 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamilnadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondent to produce the petitioner's husband Chandran, son of Kandasamy, aged about 40 years, the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Vellore before this Court and set the petitioner's husband Chandran, son of Kandasamy aged about 40 years, the detenu herein at liberty.

For Petitioner	:	Mr.S.Senthil Vel for Mr.S.Prabhudoss
For Respondents	:	Mr.R.Muniyapparaj Additional Public Prosecutor assisted by Mr.M.Sylvester John, Advocate

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 wife of detenu assailing a 'preventive detention order dated 14.07.2022 bearing reference B3/D.O.No.35/2022' [hereinafter 'impugned



H.C.P.No.1512 of 2022

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 the impugned detention order has been made by second respondent.

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

3. There is no adverse case. This solitary case which is the sole substratum of the impugned detention order is Crime No.164 of 2022 on the file of Arakkonam Taluk Police Station was initially registered for an alleged offence under Section 174(1) of The Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974)' [hereinafter 'Cr.PC' for the sake of convenience and clarity] and



H.C.P.No.1512 of 2022

subsequently altered to Sections 364, 302, 201 read with 120B 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. Mr. S.Senthil Vel, learned counsel representing Mr.S.Prabhudoss, counsel on record for petitioner and Mr.R.Muniyapparaj, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor, assisted by Mr.M.Sylvester John, learned counsel 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 in the ground case is 27.05.2022 but the impugned detention order has been made only on 14.07.2022.

6. Mr.R.Muniyapparaj, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor, submits to the contrary by saying that materials had to be collected and time was consumed in this exercise. Considering the facts / circumstances of the case on hand and nature of ground case, we find that this explanation of learned Prosecutor is unacceptable.



H.C.P.No.1512 of 2022

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 a proposal by a 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 the 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



H.C.P.No.1512 of 2022

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. Apropos, the sequitur is, captioned HCP is allowed. Impugned detention order dated 14.07.2022 bearing reference B3/D.O.No.35/2022 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru. Chandran, aged 40 years, son of Thiru.Kandasamy, 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.)

(M.N.K.,J.)

27.03.2023

Index : Yes

Neutral Citation : Yes

gpa

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

To

Page Nos.6/8



H.C.P.No.1512 of 2022

WEB COPY

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government
State of Tamil Nadu
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St.George
Chennai – 600 009
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector
of Ranipet District
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate
Ranipet District, Ranipet - 1
3. The Superintendent of Police
Ranipet, Ranipet District
4. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Vellore
Vellore District
5. The Inspector of Police
Arakkonam Taluk Police Station
Ranipet District
6. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1512 of 2022

M.SUNDAR, J.,
and
M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.,

gpa

H.C.P.No.1512 of 2022

27.03.2023

Page Nos.8/8