



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1980 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 15.06.2023

Coram

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

H.C.P.No.1980 of 2022

Nagammal

.. Petitioner

VS

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
State of Tamil Nadu, Secretariat,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 9.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Dharmapuri District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Dharmapuri, Dharmapuri District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Salem District.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Pappireddipatti Police Station,
Dharmapuri District.

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India
praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus calling for the
records relating to the second respondent pertaining to the
detention order made in S.C. No.21/2022 dated 22.08.2022 in



H.C.P.No.1980 of 2022

detaining the detenu under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 as Sexual Offender and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the said detenu namely Thiru.Jayakumar, son of Palani, aged about 30 years, who is detained at Central Prison, Salem before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Sakkarapani
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 mother of detenu assailing a 'preventive detention order dated 22.08.2022 bearing reference S.C. No.21/2022' [hereinafter 'impugned 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 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,



H.C.P.No.1980 of 2022

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 'Sexual Offender' within the meaning of Section 2(ggg) of Act 14 of 1982.

3. There is no adverse case. The ground case which is the sole substratum of the impugned detention order is Crime No.109 of 2022 on the file of Pappireddipatti Police Station for the alleged offences under Sections 5(l), 5(j)(ii), 6(1) of 'Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012' [hereinafter 'POCSO Act' 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.V.Sakkarapani, learned counsel on record for petitioner and Mr.E.Raj 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



H.C.P.No.1980 of 2022

detention has snapped as date of remand in the ground case is 28.06.2022 but the impugned detention order has been made only on 22.08.2022.

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 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



H.C.P.No.1980 of 2022

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.

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.1980 of 2022

10. Ergo, the sequitur is, captioned HCP is allowed.

Impugned detention order dated 22.08.2022 bearing reference S.C.No.21/2022 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Jayakumar, aged 30 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.)
15.06.2023

Index : Yes

Neutral Citation : Yes

mmi

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

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
State of Tamil Nadu, Secretariat,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 9.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Dharmapuri District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Dharmapuri, Dharmapuri District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Salem District.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Pappireddipatti Police Station, Dharmapuri District.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1980 of 2022

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

mmi

H.C.P.No.1980 of 2022

15.06.2023