



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1996 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 23.03.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.SUNDAR
and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.ANAND VENKATESH

H.C.P.No.1996 of 2022

Munirathna
W/o.Ramakrishnan

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1. State Rep. by
The Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate
Krishnagiri District
Krishnagiri.
3. The Superintendent of Police
Krishnagiri District
Krishnagiri.
4. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Salem.



H.C.P.No.1996 of 2022

WEB COPY

5. The Inspector of Police
Kelamangalam Police Station
Salem.

.. 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 in S.C.No.33/2022 dated 29.08.2022 on the file of the District Collector and District Magistrate, Krishnagiri District, Krishnagiri, the second respondent herein and quash the same as illegal and direct the respondent to produce the detenu, Thiru.Sathish, s/o.Ramakrishnan, aged about 23 years, now confined at Central Prison, Salem and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner	:	Ms.S.Sengkodi
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 mother of the detenu assailing a 'preventive detention order dated 29.08.2022 bearing reference S.C.No.33/2022' [hereinafter 'impugned detention order' for the sake of convenience and brevity]. To be noted, fifth



H.C.P.No.1996 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 no adverse case. This solitary case which is the sole substratum of the impugned detention order is Crime No.151 of 2022 on the file of Kelamangalam Police Station for the alleged offences under Sections 294(b), 341, 302 of 'The Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860)' [hereinafter 'IPC' for the sake of convenience and clarity] read with 3(2)(v) of Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 2015 and



H.C.P.No.1996 of 2022

subsequently altered into Sections 294(b), 341, 302, 147, 148 of IPC read with Section 3(2)(v) of Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Amendment Act, 2015 . 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. Ms.S.Sengkodi, 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 22.06.2022 but the impugned detention order has been made only on 29.08.2022.

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



H.C.P.No.1996 of 2022

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 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.



H.C.P.No.1996 of 2022

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.

10. Apropos, the sequitur is, captioned HCP is allowed. Impugned detention order dated 29.08.2022 bearing reference S.C.No.33/2022 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Sathish, aged 23 years, son of Thiru.Ramakrishnan, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith,



H.C.P.No.1996 of 2022

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.)

23.03.2023

Index : Yes

Speaking

Neutral Citation : Yes

mk

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

To

1. State Rep. by
The Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate
Krishnagiri District
Krishnagiri.
3. The Superintendent of Police
Krishnagiri District
Krishnagiri.
4. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Salem.
5. The Inspector of Police
Kelamangalam Police Station
Salem.
6. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.

Page Nos.7/8



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1996 of 2022

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

mk

H.C.P.No.1996 of 2022

23.03.2023

Page Nos.8/8