



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2610 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 13.06.2023

Coram

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

H.C.P.No.2610 of 2022

Ramamurthy

.. Petitioner

VS

State rep. By:

- 1.State of Tamil Nadu rep. By
Secretary of State,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 9.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Poonamallee High Road,
Vepery, Chennai – 7.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai – 66.
- 4.Inspector of Police,
J-6 Thiruvanmiyur Police Station,
Chennai – 41.

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying
for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus calling upon the production of



H.C.P.No.2610 of 2022

records relating to the detention order dated 03.11.2022 made in detention order Memo No.404/BCDFGISSSV/2022 passed by the second respondent herein, set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the petitioner's son Selva, son of Ramamurthy, aged about 26 years, branded as Goonda and now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Mohanraj
For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak,
Additional Public Prosecutor

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 03.11.2022 bearing reference BCDFGISSSV No.404/2022' [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.2610 of 2022

WEB COPY

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 two adverse cases. The ground case which constitutes substantial part of substratum of the impugned detention order is Crime No.311 of 2022 on the file of J-6 Thiruvannamiyur Police Station for the alleged offences under Sections 302 and 120(B) 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.C.Mohanraj, learned counsel on record for petitioner and Mr.E.Raj Thilak, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor for all respondents are before us.



H.C.P.No.2610 of 2022

WEB COPY

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 19.09.2022 but the impugned detention order has been made only on 03.11.2022.

6. Mr.E.Raj Thilak, 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



H.C.P.No.2610 of 2022

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 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.



H.C.P.No.2610 of 2022

10. Apropos, the sequitur is, captioned HCP is allowed. Impugned detention order dated 03.11.2022 bearing reference BCDFGISSSV No.404/2022 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Selva, aged 26 years, son of Thiru.Ramamurthy, 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.)
13.06.2023

Index : Yes
Neutral Citation : Yes
mmi

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

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 9.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Poonamallee High Road,
Vepery, Chennai – 7.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai – 66.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
J-6 Thiruvannamiyur Police Station,
Chennai – 41.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2610 of 2022

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

mmi

H.C.P.No.2610 of 2022

13.06.2023