



H.C.P(MD)No.1000 of 2023

1BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 10.11.2023

Coram

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE **M.SUNDAR**
and
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE **R.SAKTHIVEL**

H.C.P(MD)No.1000 of 2023

Tribhuwan Kumar Tiwari

.. Petitioner

VS

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Madurai District.

3.The Secretary to the Government of India,
Ministry of Home Affairs,
Department of Internal Security,
North Block,
New Delhi – 110 001.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Madurai Central Prison,
Madurai District.

.. Respondents



H.C.P(MD)No.1000 of 2023

WEB COPY

Prayer:- Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the entire records connected to the impugned detention order passed by the second respondent vide his proceeding reference N.S.A.No.01/2023 dated on 06.04.2023 and quash the same as illegal and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Tripurari Kumar Tiwari @ Manish Kasyap, son of Udit Kumar Tiwari, aged about 32 years, now confining at Madurai Central Prison before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner	:	Mr.Niranjan S.Kumar Assisted by Mr.R.Vignesh
For Respondent Nos.1, 2 & 4	:	Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar Additional Public Prosecutor
For Respondent No.3	:	Mr.K.Govindarajan Deputy Solicitor General of India



H.C.P(MD)No.1000 of 2023

ORDER

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

This order will now dispose of the captioned matter.

2. When the captioned matter was listed before this Bench on 31.10.2023, the following proceedings were made:

'HCP(MD)No.1000 of 2023

M.SUNDAR, J.

and

R.SAKTHIVEL, J.

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

Captioned 'Habeas Corpus Petition' [hereinafter 'HCP' for the sake of brevity] was listed in the admission board on 11.08.2023 and a Hon'ble Predecessor Co-ordinate Bench made the following order:



H.C.P.(MD)No.1000 of 2023

H.C.P.(MD)No.1000 of 2023

M.S.RAMESH, J.
AND
M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by
M.S.RAMESH, J.]

Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar, learned
Additional Public Prosecutor takes notice
for the respondents 1, 2 and 4.

2. Notice to the 3rd respondent
through Court as well as privately returnable
in eight weeks.

3. The petitioner is also permitted
to serve notice on the learned Central
Government Standing Counsel, who appears
for the 3rd respondent.

4. Post after eight weeks.

[M.S.R., J.] & [M.N.K., J.]
11.08.2023

Yuva

2. The captioned matter is now in the final hearing board and we deem it appropriate to capture factual matrix in a nutshell.

3. Factual matrix in a nutshell is that the HCP petitioner's brother one Tripurari Kumar Tiwari @ Manish



WEB COPY

Kasyap son of Udit Kumar Tiwari has been detained owing to a preventive detention order dated 06.04.2023 bearing reference N.S.A.No.01/2023 [hereinafter 'impugned preventive detention order' for the sake of brevity and clarity] made by the 2nd respondent [hereinafter 'detaining authority' for the sake of convenience]; that the impugned preventive detention order has been clamped by exercise of powers under sub section (2) of Section 3 of the National Security Act, 1980 [hereinafter 'NSA' for brevity]; that there is one ground case and two adverse cases which constitute the substratum of the impugned preventive detention order; that the ground case is Crime No.06/2023 (vide First Information Report ['FIR' for brevity] dated 10.03.2023) on the file of Madurai District Cyber Crime Police station for alleged offences under Sections 153, 153(A), 504, 505(1)(b), 505(1)(c), 505(2) of 'Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Act 45 of 1860)' ['IPC' for brevity] and Section 66D of The Information Technology Act, 2000 [hereinafter 'IT Act' for brevity]; that first adverse case is Crime No.86/2023 on the file of Krishnagiri Taluk Police Station (vide FIR dated 07.03.2023) for alleged offences under Sections 153, 153A and 505(1)(b) of IPC; that the second adverse case is Crime No.13/2023 (vide FIR dated 10.03.2023) on the file of Tiruppur District Cyber Crime Police Station for alleged offences under Sections 153B, 505(2) of IPC and Section 66D of IT Act; that the crux and gravamen of allegations qua ground case and adverse cases is that the detenu made posts in various social media alleging that persons from northern part of India [referred to as 'North Indians' in the impugned preventive



WEB COPY

detention order] especially from Bihar are being attacked in Tamil Nadu and that they are leaving Tamil Nadu and that North Indians are not safe in Tamil Nadu; that the prosecution theory is that this inter alia is an offence inciting violence between different groups; that the detenu moved Hon'ble Supreme Court of India on 04.01.2023 under Article 32 of Constitution vide W.P(Crl)No. 148/2023 with a prayer for quashing the FIRs; that pending writ petition, the impugned preventive detention order was clamped; that Hon'ble Supreme Court in and by order dated 08.05.2023 disposed of the Article 32 writ petition namely, W.P(Crl)No. 148/2023 saying that Hon'ble Supreme Court is not inclined to exercise jurisdiction under Article 32 but the rights of the detenu to pursue his remedy in accordance with law including rights in respect of impugned preventive detention order under NSA were preserved; that the detenu did not seek quash in this court but pursuant to the liberty granted by Hon'ble Supreme Court captioned HCP assailing the impugned preventive detention order has been filed; that post notice the respondents represented by State Counsel are before us.

4. In the final hearing board today, Mr.Niranjan S.Kumar learned counsel for HCP petitioner, Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for respondent Nos.1, 2 and 4 instructed by Tmt.Thendral, Inspector of Police and Tr.Karthikeyan, Sub-Inspector of Police, Cyber Crime Police Station, Madurai District, Mr.N.Ramamoorthi, learned counsel representing Mr.K.Govindarajan, learned Deputy Solicitor General of India are before us.



WEB COPY

5. *The 3rd respondent has not filed counter affidavit. Learned counsel says that the 3rd respondent is only a formal party.*

6. *However, learned Additional Public Prosecutor representing respondents 1, 2 and 4 has filed a counter affidavit [undated counter] sworn to by the detaining authority i.e., 2nd respondent.*

7. *In the final hearing board, learned counsel for petitioner raised the following points:*

(i) In paragraph 5 of the grounds of impugned preventive detention order, there is a reference to remand of detenu on 05.04.2023. Therefore, the remand order remanding the detenu on 05.04.2023 in the ground case [Crime No.06/2023] has been relied on but a copy of the same has not been furnished to the detenu;

(ii) In the same paragraph 5 of the grounds of impugned preventive detention order, it has been mentioned by the detaining authority that remand was lastly extended upto 19.04.2023. Therefore, the order extending remand upto 19.04.2023 has been relied on but a copy of extension order also has not been furnished to the detenu;



WEB COPY

(iii) *In the same paragraph 5 of the grounds of impugned preventive detention order, there is a reference to a bail order dated 20.06.2018 in Crl.O.P.No.14838/2018 in the case of one Gowthaman, this is a bail order granted by this Court (Madras High Court) and this has been relied on by the detaining authority to record subjective satisfaction as regards imminent possibility of detenu being enlarged on bail but a copy of Gowthaman's case bail order has not been furnished to the detenu;*

(iv) *On a demurrer, even if Gowthaman's case bail order is considered, it is a case of comparing Apples and Oranges as in Gowthaman's case there are no alleged offences under Sections 153, 153(A), 505(1)(c), of IPC and 66D of IT Act even according to paragraph 5 of the impugned preventive detention order.*

8. *Learned counsel submitted that there are six cases in all in Tamil Nadu and the detenu has been enlarged on bail i.e., default bail under Section 167(2) of Cr.P.C in all the six cases. Learned counsel for peitioner also submitted that the detenu has since been transferred to another Jail i.e., Beur Jail, Anisabad, Patna 800002, State of Bihar.*

9. *Learned Prosecutor requested for a short accommodation to get instructions about the jail in which the detenu is now incarcerated.*

10. *Request of learned Prosecutor acceded to and the matter will stand over till Monday for further hearing.*



WEB COPY

11. *List under the cause list sub caption 'part heard' on 06.11.2023.'*

3.The aforementioned proceedings capture petitioner's campaign against the impugned preventive detention order and it also captures the trajectory the matter has taken thus far. Therefore, we deem it appropriate to say that aforementioned earlier proceedings dated 31.10.2023 shall now be read as an integral part and parcel of this final order. Be that as it may, we are using the short forms, short references and abbreviations used in the earlier proceedings dated 31.10.2023 in the instant final order also for the sake of convenience and clarity.

4.In continuation of the earlier hearing [to be noted, captioned HCP is listed under the cause list caption 'PART HEARD' today], learned Prosecutor commenced his submissions.

5.Learned Prosecutor drew our attention to paragraph 7 of the earlier proceedings and submitted that the points raised by learned counsel for HCP petitioner and captured therein will be met one after



H.C.P(MD)No.1000 of 2023

the other. As regards the point captured in sub-paragraph (i) of paragraph 7, learned Prosecutor submitted that a case was registered against the detenu on 10.03.2023 vide Crime No.4 of 2023 in Jegadishpur Police Station, West Champaran, State of Bihar. Learned Prosecutor submitted that detenu was arrested on 18.03.2023. Thereafter, a petition for issue of 'Prisoner's Transfer Warrant' (hereinafter 'PT Warrant' for the sake of convenience and clarity) was made vide CrI.M.P.No.1420 of 2023 and the jurisdictional Magistrate being Judicial Magistrate No.I, Madurai disposed of the same on 27.03.2023 *inter alia* holding that there is an earlier PT warrant and therefore, a second PT warrant was not necessary but in the interest of justice directed the Superintendent of Beur Jail, Patna, State of Bihar to produce the accused on or before 31.03.2023 at 10.30 a.m.

6.Before proceeding further, there are two aspects as regards previous proceedings which need to be set out. One is, in paragraph 8 of the previous proceedings, there is a reference to Beur Jail, Anisabad, Patna – 800 002, State of Bihar.



H.C.P(MD)No.1000 of 2023

7.Today (10.11.2023), this Court is informed that the petitioner is lodged in Model Central Jail, Beur, Patna, Bihar State. This submission is recorded for the sake of specificity and clarity.

8.The second point is, in the earlier hearing, a question as to whether the impugned preventive detention order was made in three languages i.e., English, Tamil and Hindi by the detaining authority arose.

9.Today, learned Prosecutor clarified that the impugned preventive detention order was made simultaneously by the detaining authority in two languages only, namely English and Tamil and Hindi is a translation, i.e, a translated portion.

10.We now revert to learned Prosecutor's response to point No.1. Adverting to 27.03.2023 order, learned Prosecutor submitted that the detenu was clearly in custody till 30.03.2023 and therefore, non-furnishing of the remand order does not really make a difference. It was also pointed out that the police custody order is available.



WEB COPY

11.As regards second point (captured in sub-paragraph (ii) of paragraph 7) it was submitted that the question of non-supply of the remand extension order would arise only when the detaining authority was not aware that the detenu is under remand.

12.As regards points 3 and 4 which pertain to subjective satisfaction arrived at by the detaining authority as regards the imminent possibility of detenu being enlarged on bail, common submissions were made by the Prosecutor.

13.Learned Prosecutor placed reliance on *Ameena Begum's* case dated 04.09.2023 rendered by Hon'ble Supreme Court in a Criminal Appeal arising out of SLP (Criminal) No.8510 of 2023 [*Ameena Begum Vs. The State of Telangana and others*]. To be noted, Ameena Begum in turn refers to *Haradhan Saha's* case [*Haradhan Saha Vs. The State of West Bengal and others* reported in *AIR 1974 SC 2154*].



WEB COPY

14.Learned Prosecutor drew our attention to paragraph 24 of *Ameena Begum's* case and submitted that Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that *Rekha's* case sounds a discordant note with regard to the law laid down in *Haradhan Saha's* case [To be noted, *Rekha's* case is *Rekha Vs. State of Tamil Nadu* reported in (2011) 5 SCC 244].

15.Learned Prosecutor also placed reliance on *Nabila's* case [*State of Tamil Nadu, through Secretary to Government, Public (Law and order-F) and another Vs. Nabila and another* reported in (2015) 12 SCC 127]. To be noted, in *Nabila's* case, Hon'ble Supreme Court had restated *Ahamed Nassar's* case [*Ahamed Nassar Vs. State of Tamil Nadu reported in (1999) 8 SCC 473 : (1999) SCC (Cri) 1469*] wherein the expression 'likely to be released' and the connotation of the same was explained as chances of being bailed out in case of pending bail application. It also explains 'likely' shows that it can go either way.

16.Learned Prosecutor thereafter drew our attention to *Dimple Happy Dhakad's* case [*Union of India and another Vs.*



H.C.P(MD)No.1000 of 2023

Dimple Happy Dhakad reported in ***(2019) 20 SCC 609***] to show that

the principle is detaining authority should be aware of the fact that detenu was already in custody. Attention of this Court was also drawn to paragraph 43 of ***Dhakad's*** case to say that while Courts should lean in favour of upholding personal liberty, liberty of an individual has to be subordinated within reasonable bounds to the good of the people, as preventive detention is a measure for the protection to the Society.

17.A further point that representation dated 22.06.2023 had not been considered within a reasonable time was raised.

18.In response to this, learned State Prosecutor placed before us the following chronology and the details are as follows:

- 1.Category* : *NSA*
- 2.Detaining Authority* : *The District Collector, Madurai District.*
- 3.Detention Order dated* : *05.04.2023*
- 4.Representation of Tripurari Kumar Tiwari @ Manish Kasyap, NSA detenu dated 22.06.2023 addressed to the*



WEB COPY



H.C.P(MD)No.1000 of 2023

*Government received by this Department
from Home Department and remarks
called for from District Collector,
Madurai District on : 03.07.2023*

*5.The Parawar remarks of the Detaining
Authority viz. District Collector,
Madurai District received on : 24.07.2023*

6.Circulation note was put up on : 25.07.2023

*7.Under Secretary to Government
Public (Law & Order) Department,
considered the representation on : 26.07.2023*

*8.Additional Secretary to Government
Public (Law & Order) Department,
considered the representation on : 26.07.2023*

*9.Secretary to Government
Public (Law & Order) Department,
considered the representation on : 27.07.2023*

*10.Secretary to Government
Law Department considered the
representation on : 28.07.2023*

11.Chief Secretary to Government



WEB COPY



H.C.P(MD)No.1000 of 2023

considered the representation on : 28.07.2023

29.07.2023 (Saturday) Holiday

30.07.2023 (Sunday) Holiday

12.The Hon'ble Minister for Law

considered the representation on : 30.07.2023

13.The Hon'ble Chief Minister

considered the representation on : 01.08.2023

14.The reply sent to the detenu through

the Superintendent, Central Prison,

Madurai on : 01.08.2023

15.Hindi translation of the reply sent

to the detenu on : 14.08.2023'

19.As regards third respondent, learned Deputy Solicitor placed before us the following note and the details are as follows:

'The report as envisaged under Section 3(5) of the National Security Act, 1980, forwarded by the Secretary, Government of Tamilnadu vide letter dated 12.04.2023, was received in the Ministry on 18.04.2023 and thereafter was duly taken on note by the Union of India on 20.04.2023.



WEB COPY



H.C.P(MD)No.1000 of 2023

2.A copy of the representation dated 22.06.2023 of the detenu was received in the Ministry on 26.06.2023 and thereafter, received in the section concerned of Ministry of Home Affairs on 28.06.2023. The same was duly considered and request for revocation of detention order dated 06.04.2023 was not acceded to by the Central Government. Accordingly, the detenu along with authorities concerned were informed vide Wireless Message No.II/15027/01/2023-NSA dated 06.07.2023.'

20.We have carefully considered the rival submissions.

21.As regards first and second points namely remand order and extension of remand order not being furnished to the detenu, the question in the case on hand is while the remand order and remand extension order have been specifically relied on by the detaining authority, the same have not been furnished to the detenu, whereas the submission of learned Prosecutor turned on the point that the detaining authority was aware that the detenu was in custody on the date on which the impugned preventive detention order was made namely 06.04.2023.

[To be noted, this Court is informed that the impugned preventive



H.C.P(MD)No.1000 of 2023

detention order dated 06.04.2023 was served on the detenu on 07.04.2023].

22.As regards *Ameena Begum's* case, which in turn referred to *Haradhan Saha's* case and *Rekha's* case and that *Rekha's* case is a discordant note in law qua *Haradhan Saha's* case, we respectfully see that Hon'ble Supreme Court in paragraph 25 of *Ameena Begum's* case has made an adumbration of as many as ten points when it comes to testing subjective satisfaction when recorded by the detaining authority as regards the imminent possibility of detenu being enlarged on bail.

23.There are two aspects to this matter.

24.*Ameena Begum's* case would come to the aid of the Prosecutor if Gowthaman's case had been made available to the detenu. In the case on hand, the point is more on not furnishing to the detenu a copy of a similar bail order i.e, Gowthaman's case which has been relied on and not on a comparison of Gowthaman's case with the case on hand. Therefore, while we respectfully follow *Ameena Begum's* principles,



we have no difficulty in holding that **Ameena Begum's** case does not come to the aid of the Prosecutor in the case on hand. The second facet of this aspect is out of adumbration of ten points in paragraph 25 qua comparison of a similar case in **Ameena Begum's** case, point No.(vi) reads as follows:

'(vi) the satisfaction of the detaining authority rests on materials which are of rationally probative value, and the detaining authority has given due regard to the matters as per the statutory mandate.'

25.A perusal of point No.(vi) will make it clear that the satisfaction of the detaining authority should rest on materials which are rationally probative. In the case on hand, the material i.e., Gowthaman's case is not before us and it was not furnished to the detenu. Therefore, even if **Ameena Begum's** case is applied to the case on hand, in the light of point No.(vi) in adumbration in paragraph 25, we are of the view that the impugned preventive detention order does not pass muster and does not clear the fence as regards material with probative value. The reason is, Gowthaman's case was not before the detaining authority.



H.C.P(MD)No.1000 of 2023

26. There is yet another facet of this matter, Gowthaman's case bail order has not been furnished to the detenu. Absent Gowthaman's case which is a benchmark for recording subjective satisfaction, we have no hesitation in saying that the sanctus and sacrosanct constitutional safeguard ingrained in Clause (5) of Article 22 of the Constitution of India is breached. In other words, to put it differently, if Gowthaman's case bail had been furnished to the detenu, the detenu could have made an effective representation with regard to subjective satisfaction.

27. This Court has repeatedly held that if the right of the detenu to make an effective representation which is a constitutional safeguard ingrained in Clause (5) of Article 22 is breached, that would vitiate an impugned preventive detention order.

28. Reverting to the remand extension, we find that the remand on 30.03.2023 was upto 03.04.2023 at 10.30 a.m and we also find that the Investigating Agency i.e., police have sought for extension of the same but whether extension was granted is not supported by any



H.C.P(MD)No.1000 of 2023

material and there was nothing to demonstrate that such material was before the detaining authority and such material has not been furnished to the detenu. This by itself concludes the matter in favour of the argument of learned counsel for petitioner. In other words, we are of the view that the submission of learned counsel for HCP petitioner (even if tested on a demurrer that the detaining authority was aware of detenu being in custody) that would not enure to the benefit of the prosecution as vide the remand order, remand was granted upto 03.04.2023 whereas the impugned preventive detention order has been made only on 06.04.2023. This clinches the matter in favour of petitioner in petitioner's campaign against the impugned preventive detention order.

29.It can be seen from sub-paragraph (iv) of paragraph 7 of our earlier proceedings that even on a demurrer, Gowthaman's case is vastly different but as we are going on the principle that the order has not been furnished to the detenu and that there is nothing to demonstrate that this order was before the detaining authority, we refrain ourselves from going into this comparison. In any event, that was a demurrer argument that was made by learned counsel for HCP petitioner. In HCP



H.C.P(MD)No.1000 of 2023

jurisprudence, it is well settled that if the impugned preventive detention order gets vitiated and becomes liable for being dislodged on one point, it may not be necessary to go into other points.

30.However, as the delay in considering the representation point was raised, we find that as regards respondents 1 and 2, counter-affidavit says that the rejection order was served on the detenu on 01.08.2023. The point that is raised in paragraph (j) of the affidavit has been met in the following manner in paragraph (j) of the counter-affidavit. It is only the translation which was served on 14.08.2023. Learned Prosecutor pointed out that representation dated 22.06.2023 itself is in English and therefore, a rejection order in English has been served on the detenu but as regards third respondent, we find that representation received by the Ministry on 26.06.2023 was processed by 28.06.2023 but the detenu along with the authorities concerned were informed by wireless message only on 06.07.2023. The period between 28.06.2023 and 06.07.2023 remains unexplained. To be noted, as already alluded to supra, third respondent has not filed counter-affidavit.



H.C.P(MD)No.1000 of 2023

31.As regards delay in considering representation, this Court has repeatedly interfered in cases of this nature vide ***Jailani Vs. the Secretary to Government, Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution (Department of Consumer Affairs) Room No. 270, Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi and others*** reported vide Neutral Citation of Madras High Court being **2023:MHC:4478** and ***Mayan Vs. The Secretary to Government, Home, Prohibition and Excise Department, Secretariat, Fort St.George, Chennai and others*** reported vide Neutral Citation of Madras High Court being **2023:MHC:4487**. Therefore, this point also enures to the benefit of the detenu i.e., HCP petitioner.

32.It may be necessary to refer to ***Nabila's case*** and ***Dimple Happy Dhakad's case*** as the same have been pressed into service by learned Prosecutor.

33.As regards ***Nabila's case***, the question of whether the detaining authority was aware of the detention or that he was in remand as on the date of the impugned preventive detention order has already



been delineated supra and therefore, it does not come to the aid of the Prosecutor. As regards ***Dimple Happy Dhakad's*** case, we respectfully find that on facts it does not come to the aid of the Prosecutor. We respectfully reminded ourselves of the celebrated constitutional Bench declaration of law in **Padma Sundara Rao's** case [***Padma Sundara Rao (dead) and others Vs. State of Tamil Nadu and others*** reported in (2002) 3 SCC 533] and paragraph 9 thereat reads as follows:

'9.Courts should not place reliance on decisions without discussing as to how the factual situation fits in with the fact situation of the decision on which reliance is placed. There is always peril in treating the words of a speech or judgment as though they are words in a legislative enactment, and it is to be remembered that judicial utterances are made in the setting of the facts of a particular case, said Lord Morris in Herrington v. British Railways Board [(1972) 2 WLR 537 : 1972 AC 877 (HL) [Sub nom British Railways Board v. Herrington, (1972) 1 All ER 749 (HL)]]. Circumstantial flexibility, one additional or different fact may make a world of difference between conclusions in two cases.'

34.The reason is **Dimple Happy Dhakad's** case arose under COFEPOSA and it was a case where huge consignments of gold were brought into the Country (to be noted, this is a prosecution theory and ***Dimple Happy Dhakad's*** case deals with a preventive detention order



H.C.P(MD)No.1000 of 2023

under COFEPOSA and therefore, we emphasize that it is a Prosecution theory) and it is in that context that Hon'ble Supreme Court went into the question of balance between 'liberty' and 'larger public good'.

35.We are respectfully following the declaration of law by the Constitutional Bench in **Padma Sundara Rao's** case and more particularly paragraph 9 thereat and we hold that ***Dimple Happy Dhakad's*** case does not come to the aid of the Prosecution.

36.In the light of the discussion, dispositive reasoning set out supra, this Court comes to the conclusion that the impugned preventive detention order deserves to be dislodged in the habeas legal drill on hand. Though obvious, this Court makes it clear that as regards the six cases as against the detenu, it would be for the investigation agency / prosecution to pursue the matter on its own merits and in accordance with law untrammelled by any of the observations made in this order as this order has been made for the limited purpose of testing the impugned preventive detention order in a habeas legal drill. In any event, as already alluded to supra, in all six cases, the detenu has been



H.C.P(MD)No.1000 of 2023

enlarged on default bail under Section 167(2) Cr.P.C and there is no
disputation or contestation on this aspect of the matter.

37.Ergo, the sequitur is, captioned HCP is allowed.
Impugned preventive detention order dated 06.04.2023 bearing
reference N.S.A.No.01/2023 made by the second respondent is set aside
and the detenu Thiru.Tripurari Kumar Tiwari @ Manish Kasyap, aged
32 years, son of Thiru.Udit Kumar Tiwari, 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.)
10.11.2023

Index : Yes

Neutral Citation : Yes

ps

P.S: Registry to forthwith communicate this order to Jail authorities in Central Prison, Madurai and Model Central Jail, Beur, Patna, Bihar. All concerned to act on this order being uploaded in official website of this Court without insisting on certified hard copies. To be noted, this order when uploaded in official website of this Court will be watermarked and will also have a QR code.



H.C.P(MD)No.1000 of 2023

WEB CUM

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Madurai District.
3. The Secretary to the Government of India,
Ministry of Home Affairs,
Department of Internal Security,
North Block,
New Delhi – 110 001.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Madurai Central Prison,
Madurai District.
5. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and Order) Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai.
6. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P(MD)No.1000 of 2023

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

ps

H.C.P(MD)No.1000 of 2023

10.11.2023