



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1936 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 28.03.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.SUNDAR
and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

H.C.P.No.1936 of 2022

Surendhar
S/o.Sridhar

.. Petitioner/Son of Detenu

Vs.

- 1.The State of Tamilnadu
Represented by Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Mayiladuthurai District,
Mayiladuthurai.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Mayiladuthurai District,
Mayiladuthurai.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
PEW Mayiladuthurai Police Station,
Mayiladuthurai District.
- 5.The Superintendent of Prison,
Special Prison for Women,
Thiruchirappalli.

.. Respondents



H.C.P.No.1936 of 2022

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 records relating to the detention order dated 09.09.2022 passed by the second respondent in his proceedings No.C.O.C.No.37/2022 and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's mother namely Sumithra, Wife of Sridhar aged about 40 years, who is presently undergoing detention in the Special Prison for Women, Thiruchirappalli, as Bootlegger before this Court and set her at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Vinoth
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 son of a detenu assailing a 'preventive detention order dated 09.09.2022 bearing reference C.O.C.No.37/2022' [hereinafter 'impugned detention order' for the sake of convenience and brevity]. To be noted, fourth 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.1936 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 'Bootlegger' within the meaning of Section 2(b) of Act 14 of 1982.

3. There are four adverse cases and one ground case. The ground case which is the substratum of the impugned detention order is Crime No.478 of 2022 on the file of Sirkazhi Prohibition Enforcement Wing for alleged offences under Sections 4(1)(aaa), 4(1)(i) read with 4(1-A) of 'The Tamil Nadu Prohibition Act, 1937 (Tamil Nadu Act No.10 of 1937)' [hereinafter 'Act 10 of 1937' 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.



H.C.P.No.1936 of 2022

WEB COPY

4. Mr.M.Vinoth, learned counsel 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 28.07.2022 but the impugned detention order has been made only on 09.09.2022.

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.

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



H.C.P.No.1936 of 2022

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 **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



H.C.P.No.1936 of 2022

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 09.09.2022 bearing reference C.O.C.No.37/2022 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Tmt.Sumithra, aged 40 years, wife of Thiru.Sridhar, now detained in Special Prison for Women, Thiruchirappalli is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless required in connection with any other case/s. There shall be no order as to costs.

(M.S.,J.) (M.N.K.,J.)
28.03.2023

Index : Yes / No
Speaking / Non-speaking
Neutral Citation : Yes / No
rsi

P.S: Registry to forthwith communicate this order to Jail authorities in Special Prison for Women, Thiruchirappalli.



H.C.P.No.1936 of 2022

WEB COPY

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Mayiladuthurai District,
Mayiladuthurai.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Mayiladuthurai District,
Mayiladuthurai.
4. The Inspector of Police,
PEW Mayiladuthurai Police Station,
Mayiladuthurai District.
5. The Superintendent of Prison,
Special Prison for Women,
Thiruchirappalli.
6. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1936 of 2022

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

rsi

H.C.P.No.1936 of 2022

28.03.2023