



H.C.P.No.1722 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21.03.2023

CORAM

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

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.ANAND VENKATESH**

H.C.P.No.1722 of 2022

L.Jabamalar  
W/o.Issac

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu  
Rep. by its Secretary to Govt.  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department  
Chennai-600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate  
Chengalpattu District  
Chengalpattu.
3. The Superintendent of Police  
Chengalpattu District  
Chengalpattu.
4. The Superintendent of Prison  
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.
5. The Inspector of Police  
Padalam Police Station

Page Nos.1/8



H.C.P.No.1722 of 2022

Chengalpattu District.

.. Respondents

WEB COPY

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus to call for the entire records leading to the detention of the petitioner's husband Issac, son of Duraipandi, male aged about 32 years, the detenu herein presently lodged in Central Prison, Puzhal at Chennai who has been detained under Act 14/82 as a "Goonda" vide detention order dated 02.08.2022 made in CPT No.42/2022 by the 2nd respondent and quash the same and consequently, direct the respondents herein to produce the body and person of the said detenu before this Hon'ble Court and thereafter set him at liberty from the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

|                 |   |                                                                                                   |
|-----------------|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For Petitioner  | : | Mr.M.Rajavelu                                                                                     |
| For Respondents | : | Mr.R.Muniyapparaj<br>Additional Public Prosecutor<br>assisted by<br>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 02.08.2022 bearing reference CPT No.42/2022' [hereinafter 'impugned detention order' for the sake of convenience and brevity]. To be noted, fifth



*H.C.P.No.1722 of 2022*

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 one adverse case. The ground case which is the sole substratum of the impugned detention order is Crime No.256 of 2022 on the file of Padalam 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] and subsequently altered into Sections 120(B), 147, 448, 323, 302 and 201 of IPC. Owing to the nature of the challenge to the



*H.C.P.No.1722 of 2022*

impugned detention order, it is not necessary to delve into the factual matrix or be detained further by facts.

4. Mr.M.Rajavelu, learned 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 remand in the ground case is 13.06.2022 but the impugned detention order has been made only on 02.08.2022.

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.1722 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.1722 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 02.08.2022 bearing reference CPT No.42/2022 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Issac, aged 32 years, son of Thiru.Duraipandi, 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.)

(N.A.V.,J.)

21.03.2023

Index : Yes

Speaking

Neutral Citation : Yes

mk

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

Page Nos.6/8



H.C.P.No.1722 of 2022

To  
WEB COPY

1. The State of Tamil Nadu  
Rep. by its Secretary to Govt.  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department  
Chennai-600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate  
Chengalpattu District  
Chengalpattu.
3. The Superintendent of Police  
Chengalpattu District  
Chengalpattu.
4. The Superintendent of Prison  
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.
5. The Inspector of Police  
Padalam Police Station  
Chengalpattu District.
6. The Public Prosecutor  
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



*H.C.P.No.1722 of 2022*

**M.SUNDAR, J.,**  
**and**  
**N.ANAND VENKATESH, J.,**

mk

H.C.P.No.1722 of 2022

21.03.2023  
(3/4)

Page Nos.8/8