



H.C.P.No.2507 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 12.06.2023

Coram

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE **M.SUNDAR**
and
THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE **K. GOVINDARAJAN THILAKAVADI**

H.C.P.No.2507 of 2022

Sivasakthi

.. Petitioner

VS

1.State of Tamil Nadu rep. By
The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 9.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Vepery, Chennai – 7.

3.The Inspector of Police,
P6 Kodungaiyur Police Station,
Chennai.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison II, Puzhal, Chennai – 66.

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus calling for the records relating to the detention order in Memo No.407/BCDFGISSSV/2022 dated 04.11.2022 passed by the second respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's husband Thiru.Arumugam, S/o.Suruttai



H.C.P.No.2507 of 2022

Padaiyachi, aged about 40 years, the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set the petitioner's husband Thiru.Arumugam, S/o.Suruttai Padaiyachi, aged about 40 years, the detenu herein at liberty.

For Petitioner	:	Mr.R.Muthukumar
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 wife of detenu assailing a 'preventive detention order dated 04.11.2022 bearing reference No.407/BCDFGISSSV/2022' [hereinafter 'impugned detention order' for the sake of convenience and brevity]. To be noted, third 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



H.C.P.No.2507 of 2022

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.699 of 2022 on the file of P-6 Kodungaiyur Police Station under Section 174 of 'The Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974)' [hereinafter 'CrPC' for the sake of brevity and clarity], subsequently altered into one under Section 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.R.Muthukumar, 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.



H.C.P.No.2507 of 2022

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 27.09.2022 but the impugned detention order has been made only on 04.11.2022.

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 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.



H.C.P.No.2507 of 2022

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 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 04.11.2022 bearing reference



H.C.P.No.2507 of 2022

No.407/BCDFGISSSV/2022 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Arumugam, aged 40 years, son of Thiru.Suruttai Padaiyachi, 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.) (K.G.T.,J.)
12.06.2023

Index : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No
mmi

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

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 9.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Vepery, Chennai – 7.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
P6 Kodungaiyur Police Station,
Chennai.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison II, Puzhal, Chennai – 66.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2507 of 2022

**M.SUNDAR, J.,
and
K. GOVINDARAJAN THILAKAVADI, J.,**

mmi

H.C.P.No.2507 of 2022

12.06.2023