



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2247 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 18.04.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.SUNDAR
and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

H.C.P.No.2247 of 2022

M.Venkatachalam
S/o.Marudhamuthu

.. Petitioner/Father of Detenu

Vs.

- 1.The State of Tamilnadu rep. by
Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate
of Perambalur District,
Perambalur.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Perambalur District,
Perambalur.
- 4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirapalli.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Kai.Kalathur Police Station,
Kai.Kalathur, Veppanthattai Taluk,
Perambalur District.

.. Respondents



H.C.P.No.2247 of 2022

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 connection with the order of detention dated 21.09.2022 passed by the 2nd respondent herein at Perambalur in Cr.M.P.No.32/2022, quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's son Mathivanan, aged 25 years, Vembavoor Village, Veppanthattai Taluk, Perambalur District, who is compound at Central Prison, Tiruchirapalli, under Section 3(1) of 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) before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Mani

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 father of detenu assailing a 'preventive detention order dated 21.09.2022 bearing reference Cr.M.P.No.32/2022' [hereinafter 'impugned detention order' for the sake of convenience and brevity]. To be noted, fifth



H.C.P.No.2247 of 2022

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, 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 and one ground case. The ground case which is the substratum of the impugned detention order is Crime No.130 of 2022 on the file of Kai.Kalathur Police Station for alleged offences under Sections 294(b), 323 and 307 of 'The Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860)' [hereinafter 'IPC' for the sake of convenience and clarity] and subsequently altered into Sections 294(b), 323, 307 and 302 of IPC. 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.2247 of 2022

4. Mr.P.Mani, 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 13.08.2022 but the impugned detention order has been made only on 21.09.2022.

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 arose under 'Prevention of Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1988' [hereinafter 'PIT NDPS Act' for the sake of brevity] in



H.C.P.No.2247 of 2022

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 Madras High Court being **2023:MHC:1159** and a series of other orders in HCP cases.



H.C.P.No.2247 of 2022

WEB COPY

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 21.09.2022 bearing reference Cr.M.P.No.32/2022 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Mathivanan, aged 25 years, son of Thiru.Venkatachalam, now detained in Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli 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.)
18.04.2023

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

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



H.C.P.No.2247 of 2022

To

WEB CUM

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate
of Perambalur District,
Perambalur.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Perambalur District,
Perambalur.
- 4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirapalli.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Kai.Kalathur Police Station,
Kai.Kalathur, Veppanthattai Taluk,
Perambalur District.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2247 of 2022

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

rsi

H.C.P.No.2247 of 2022

18.04.2023