



H.C.P.No.2505 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 02.06.2023

CORAM

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

H.C.P.No.2505 of 2022

M.Alumelu

.. Petitioner

Vs

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 9.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Chennai.

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai – 66.

4.The Inspector of Police,
V4 Rajamangalam Police Station,
Chennai.

.. 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
connection with the order of detention passed by the second
respondent dated 07.10.2022 in No.338/BCDFGISSSV/2022 against

Page Nos.1/8



H.C.P.No.2505 of 2022

the petitioner's son Jeeva @ Eeral, aged 22 years, S/o.Mani, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai and to set aside the same and consequently direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Mohamed Saifulla
for Mr.K.Kannan

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 mother of the detenu assailing a 'preventive detention order dated 07.10.2022 bearing reference No.338/BCDFGISSSV/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.2505 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 are seven adverse cases. The ground case which is the sole substratum of the impugned detention order is Crime No.697 of 2022 on the file of V-4 Rajamangalam Police Station for alleged offences under Sections 341, 294(b), 336, 427, 392, 397 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.

4. Mr.M.Mohamed Saifulla, learned counsel representing Mr.K.Kannan, learned counsel on record for petitioner and



H.C.P.No.2505 of 2022

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 06.09.2022 but the impugned detention order has been made only on 07.10.2022.

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 for the same. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and nature of ground case, we find that this explanation of learned State Additional Public 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



H.C.P.No.2505 of 2022

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 the proposal by the 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 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**



H.C.P.No.2505 of 2022

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 07.10.2022 bearing reference No.338/BCDFGISSSV/2022 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Jeeva @ Eeral, aged 22 years, son of Thiru.Mani, 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.) (R.S.V.,J.)
02.06.2023

Index : Yes
Neutral Citation : Yes
mmi

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

Page Nos.6/8



H.C.P.No.2505 of 2022

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 9.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Chennai.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai – 66.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
V4 Rajamangalam Police Station,
Chennai.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2505 of 2022

**M.SUNDAR, J.,
and
R.SAKTHIVEL, J.,**

mmi

H.C.P.No.2505 of 2022

02.06.2023

Page Nos.8/8