



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2408 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 26.04.2023

CORAM

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

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR**

H.C.P.No.2408 of 2022

Mathiazhagan

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,  
Tambaram City, Chennai – 45.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison, Puzhal,  
Chennai.

4.The Inspector of Police,  
T-4 Sankar Nagar Police Station,  
Chennai – 45.  
[Crime No.514/2022]

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying

Page Nos.1/8



H.C.P.No.2408 of 2022

for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus calling for the records from the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent in BCDFGISSSV No.174/2022 dated 21.10.2022 and by setting aside the order of detention passed by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent and produce the detenu Yuvaraj son of Mathiazhagan, aged about 26 years before this Court and set him at liberty now detained in Central Prison, Puzhal.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Illanchezian  
for Mr.S.Sairaman

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj  
Additional Public Prosecutor  
Assisted by Mr.M.Sylvester John

### **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 21.10.2022 bearing reference BCDFGISSSV No.174/2022' [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.2408 of 2022

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. The ground case which is the sole substratum of the impugned detention order is Crime No.514/2022 on the file of T-4 Sankar Nagar Police Station for alleged offences under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 341, 307, 302 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.

4. Mr.V.Illanchezian, learned counsel representing learned counsel on record for petitioner and Mr.R.Muniyapparaj, learned State Additional



H.C.P.No.2408 of 2022

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 06.09.2022 but the impugned detention order has been made only on 21.10.2022.

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



H.C.P.No.2408 of 2022

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**



H.C.P.No.2408 of 2022

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 21.10.2022 bearing reference BCDFGISSSV No.174/2022 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Yuvaraj, male, aged 26 years, son of Thiru.Mathiazhagan 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.)

(M.N.K.,J.)

26.04.2023

Index : Yes / No

Speaking / Non-speaking

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

cse

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



H.C.P.No.2408 of 2022

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,  
Tambaram City, Chennai – 45.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison, Puzhal,  
Chennai.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,  
T-4 Sankar Nagar Police Station,  
Chennai – 45.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor  
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



*H.C.P.No.2408 of 2022*

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

*cse*

H.C.P.No.2408 of 2022

26.04.2023

Page Nos.8/8