



H.C.P.No.2448 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.03.2023

CORAM

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

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

H.C.P.No.2448 of 2022

R.Kavitha

W/o.Ranjith @ Ranjithkumar

... Petitioner /Wife of the detenu

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu  
rep. By the Additional Chief Secretary to Government  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department  
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector  
Tiruppur  
Tiruppur District
3. The Superintendent of Police  
Tiruppur  
Tiruppur District
4. The Superintendent of Prison  
Central Prison, Coimbatore  
Coimbatore District

Page Nos.1/8



H.C.P.No.2448 of 2022

WEB COPY

5. The Inspector of Police  
Udumalaipettai Police Station  
Tiruppur 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 entire records relating to the petitioner's husband, detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order dated 01.08.2022 on the file of the second respondent herein made in proceedings Memo Cr.M.P.No.46/Goonda/2022, quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's husband, namely Ranjith @ Ranjithkumar, son of Duraiselvam (late), aged 29 years before this Court and set the petitioner's husband at liberty from detention, now the petitioner's husband detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore.

For Petitioner : Ms.S.Nadhiya

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 wife of detenu assailing a 'preventive detention order dated 01.08.2022 bearing reference Cr.M.P.No.46/Goonda/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



H.C.P.No.2448 of 2022

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 one adverse case. The ground case which is the sole substratum of the impugned detention order is Crime No.277 of 2022 on the file of Udumalaipettai Police Station for the alleged offence under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 324 and 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.



H.C.P.No.2448 of 2022

4. Ms.S.Nadhiya, 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 21.06.2022 but the impugned detention order has been made only on 01.08.2022.

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 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



H.C.P.No.2448 of 2022

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.2448 of 2022

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 01.08.2022 bearing reference Cr.M.P.No.46/Goonda/2022 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru. Ranjith @ Ranjithkumar, aged 29 years, son of Thiru.Duraiselvam (Late), 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.)  
27.03.2023

Index : Yes/No  
Neutral Citation : Yes  
gpa

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



H.C.P.No.2448 of 2022

To

WEB COPY

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department  
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector  
Tiruppur  
Tiruppur District
3. The Superintendent of Police  
Tiruppur  
Tiruppur District
4. The Superintendent of Prison  
Central Prison, Coimbatore  
Coimbatore District
5. The Inspector of Police  
Udumalaipettai Police Station  
Tiruppur District
6. The Public Prosecutor  
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



*H.C.P.No.2448 of 2022*

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

gpa

H.C.P.No.2448 of 2022

27.03.2023

Page Nos.8/8