



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1696 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 13.03.2023

CORAM

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

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR**

H.C.P.No.1696 of 2022

B.Ramesh

..

Petitioner/  
Detenu

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,  
Rep. by the Secretary to the Government,  
Prohibition & Excise Department  
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,  
Greater Avadi City,  
Chennai – 600 054.

3.The Inspector of Police,  
T-15, S.R.M.C. Police Station,  
Chennai – 600 067.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison, Puzhal,  
Chennai.

..

Respondents

Page Nos.1/8



H.C.P.No.1696 of 2022

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus calling for the records pertaining to filing memo No.76/BCDFGISSSV/2022 dated 14.07.2022 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein and set aside the same as direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner Ramesh S/o. Balaraman aged 42 years now confined in the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Murthy

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 detenu assailing a 'preventive detention order dated 14.07.2022 bearing reference No.76/BCDFGISSSV//2022' [hereinafter 'impugned detention order' for the sake of convenience and brevity]. To be noted, third respondent is the sponsoring authority and second respondent is the detaining authority as impugned detention order has been made by second respondent.



H.C.P.No.1696 of 2022

WEB COPY

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 are seven adverse cases. The ground case which is the sole substratum of the impugned detention order is Crime No.352 of 2022 on the file of T-15 SRMC Police Station for alleged offences under Sections 341, 294(b), 336, 427, 397 and 506(ii) 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.P.Murthy, learned counsel on record for petitioner and Mr.E.Raj



H.C.P.No.1696 of 2022

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 04.06.2022 but the impugned detention order has been made only on 14.07.2022.

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 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



H.C.P.No.1696 of 2022

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.

8.To be noted, **Banik** case has been respectfully followed by this Bench in **Gomathi Vs.The Principal Secretary to Government and others** reported in **2023/MHC/334**, **Sadik Basha Yusuf Vs. The State of Tamil Nadu and others** reported in **2023/MHC/733** and series of other HCP matters.

9.Before concluding, we also remind ourselves that preventive detention is not a punishment and HCP is a high prerogative writ.



H.C.P.No.1696 of 2022

WEB COPY

10. Apropos, the sequitur is, captioned HCP is allowed. Impugned detention order dated 14.07.2022 bearing reference No.76/BCDFGISSSV//2022 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Ramesh, male, aged 42 years, son of Thiru.Balaraman 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.)

13.03.2023

Index : Yes / No

Speaking / Non-speaking

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

cse

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



*H.C.P.No.1696 of 2022*

To

WEB COPY

1. The Secretary to the Government,  
Prohibition & Excise Department  
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,  
Greater Avadi City,  
Chennai – 600 054.
3. The Inspector of Police,  
T-15, S.R.M.C. Police Station,  
Chennai – 600 067.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison, Puzhal,  
Chennai.
6. The Public Prosecutor  
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



*H.C.P.No.1696 of 2022*

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

*cse*

H.C.P.No.1696 of 2022

13.03.2023

Page Nos.8/8