



H.C.P.No.2091 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.2091 of 2022

Stella  
W/o.Dhinakaran

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State  
Represented by  
The Secretary to the Government  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department  
Government of Tamil Nadu  
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate  
Vellore District  
Vellore.
3. The Superintendent of Police  
Vellore District,  
Vellore.
4. The Superintendent of Prison  
Central Prison,  
Vellore.

Page Nos.1/8



H.C.P.No.2091 of 2022

WEB COPY

5. The Inspector of Police  
Thiruvallam Police Station  
Vellore District.

.. 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 of the 2nd respondent in connection with order made in proceedings C3/D.O.No.85 dated 24.08.2022 passed against petitioner's son Sathish Kumar, age 20 years son of Dhinakaran, who is now confined at Central Prison, Vellore and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

|                 |   |                               |
|-----------------|---|-------------------------------|
| For Petitioner  | : | Mr.S.Thirugnanam              |
| 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 24.08.2022 bearing reference C3/D.O.No.85/2022' [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 the impugned detention order has been made by



H.C.P.No.2091 of 2022

second respondent.

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 is no adverse case. This solitary case which is the sole substratum of the impugned detention order is Crime No.214 of 2022 on the file of Thiruvallur Police Station for the alleged offences under Sections 294(b), 324, 326, 307 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.



H.C.P.No.2091 of 2022

4. Mr.S.Thirugnanam, 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 arrest in the ground case is 06.07.2022 but the impugned detention order has been made only on 24.08.2022.

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.

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.2091 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



H.C.P.No.2091 of 2022

**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 24.08.2022 bearing reference C3/D.O.No.85/2022 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Sathishkumar, aged 20 years, son of Dhinakaran, 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.)

23.03.2023

Index : Yes

Speaking

Neutral Citation : Yes

mk

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

Page Nos.6/8



H.C.P.No.2091 of 2022

To  
WEB COPY

1. The State  
Represented by  
The Secretary to the Government  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department  
Government of Tamil Nadu  
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate  
Vellore District  
Vellore.
3. The Superintendent of Police  
Vellore District,  
Vellore.
4. The Superintendent of Prison  
Central Prison,  
Vellore.
5. The Inspector of Police  
Thiruvalam Police Station  
Vellore District.
6. The Public Prosecutor  
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



*H.C.P.No.2091 of 2022*

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

mk

H.C.P.No.2091 of 2022

23.03.2023

Page Nos.8/8