



HCP(MD)No.693 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 30.10.2023

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.SUNDAR

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SAKTHIVEL

H.C.P.(MD)No.693 of 2023

M.Sasireka

: Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. By Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli District.
- 4.The Superintendent,
District Jail,
Perurani,
Thoothukudi District.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Vicramasingapuram Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.

: Respondents



HCP(MD)No.693 of 2023

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records connected with the detention order of the respondent No.2 in Detention order No.M.H.S.Confdl No.49 of 2023 dated 21.05.2023 and to quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu, Murugan @ Keerthi, Son of Sappani, aged about 27 years, before this Court and set him at liberty, now detained as 'Goonda' District Jail, Perurani, Thoothukudi District.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Saravana Kumar

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by **M.SUNDAR, J.**]


When the captioned 'Habeas Corpus Petition' [hereinafter 'HCP' for the sake of brevity] was listed in the Admission Board on 13.06.2023, a Hon'ble Coordinate Division Bench made the following order in the Admission Board:



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.693 of 2023



2. It has now become necessary to set out a thumbnail sketch of factual matrix and we do so in the paragraphs infra.

3. Today, the captioned matter is in the Final Hearing Board.

4. Mr.C.Saravana Kumar, learned counsel on record for petitioner and Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor for all respondents are before us.



HCP(MD)No.693 of 2023

5. Captioned HCP has been filed by the wife of the detenu assailing a 'preventive detention order dated 21.05.2023 bearing M.H.S.Confdl No. 49/2023' [hereinafter 'impugned preventive detention order' for the sake of brevity and convenience]. To be noted, fifth respondent is the sponsoring authority and second respondent is the detaining authority as impugned preventive detention order has been made by second respondent.

6. Impugned preventive 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.

7. There is no adverse case. The ground case which constitutes sole substratum of the impugned preventive detention order is Crime No.104 of 2023 on the file of Vickiramasasingapuram Police Station registered under Sections 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 307, 342, 324, 323 and 506(ii) of 'The



HCP(MD)No.693 of 2023

Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860)' [hereinafter 'IPC' for the sake of convenience and clarity] which was subsequently altered into Sections 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 307, 342, 324, 323, 506(ii) and 120B of IPC. Considering the nature of the challenge to the impugned detention order, it is not necessary to delve into the factual matrix of the case.

8. In the support affidavit *qua* captioned HCP several grounds have been raised but learned Counsel for petitioner predicated his campaign against the impugned Preventive Detention Order on the point that the detenu was arrested on 22.04.2023 but the impugned preventive detention order has been made only on 21.05.2023 resulting in live and proximate link between grounds and purpose of detention getting snapped.

9. Mr.Thiruvadi Kumar, 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.



10. 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 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 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.

11. 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*



HCP(MD)No.693 of 2023

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 similar orders in HCP cases.

12. To be noted, the impugned preventive detention order is predicated on a solitary case viz., Crime No.104 of 2023 on the file of Vickiramasingapuram Police Station registered under Sections 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 307, 342, 324, 323 and 506(ii) of IPC which was subsequently altered into Sections 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 307, 342, 324, 323, 506(ii) and 120B of IPC and therefore this solitary case is the sole substratum of the impugned preventive detention order.

13. Before concluding, we also remind ourselves that preventive detention is not a punishment and HCP is a high prerogative writ.

14. Ergo, the sequitur is, captioned HCP is allowed. Impugned preventive detention order dated 21.05.2023 bearing reference



HCP(MD)No.693 of 2023

M.H.S.Confdl No.49/2023 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Murugan alias Keerthi, male, aged 27 years, son of Thiru.Sappani, 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.]
30.10.2023

vsm

Index : Yes

Neutral Citation : Yes

P.S: Registry to forthwith communicate this order to Jail authorities in District Jail, Perurani and Central Prison, Palayamkottai.



HCP(MD)No.693 of 2023

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli District.
- 4.The Superintendent,
District Jail,
Perurani,
Thoothukudi District.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Vicramasingapuram Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
- 6.Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and Order) Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.
- 7.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

M.SUNDAR, J.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.693 of 2023

and

R.SAKTHIVEL, J.

vsm

H.C.P.(MD)No.693 of 2023

30.10.2023