



HCP(MD)No.938 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 30.10.2023

CORAM :

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

**HCP(MD)No.938 of 2023**

Paruvatham

... Petitioner

vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,  
Rep. by Additional Chief Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009.

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,  
Ramanathapuram District, Ramanathapuram.

3. The Superintendent,  
Central Prison,  
Madurai.

... Respondents

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 with the detention order of the respondent No.2 in S.R.No. 01/Goonda/2023 dated 31.05.2023 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Pallu Bala alias Balamurugan son of Selvam aged about 34 years now detained at Madurai Central Prison before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.J.Vishnu

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar

Additional Public Prosecutor



WEB COPY




HCP(MD)No.938 of 2023

## 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 31.07.2023, a Hon'ble Coordinate Division Bench made the following order in the Admission Board:



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



WEB COPY

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

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

5. Captioned 'Habeas Corpus Petition' [hereinafter 'HCP' for the sake of convenience and clarity] has been filed by the mother of the detenu assailing the 'preventive detention order dated 31.05.2023 bearing reference in S.R.No.01/Goonda/2023' [hereinafter 'impugned preventive detention order' for the sake of brevity and convenience]. To be noted, sponsoring authority has not been arrayed as a respondent and we find that Station House Officer of Devipattinam Police Station, is the sponsoring authority [hereinafter 'sponsoring authority' for convenience and brevity] and second respondent is the detaining authority as impugned preventive detention order has been made by second respondent.

6. 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



HCP(MD)No.938 of 2023

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 are four adverse cases and one ground case. The ground case which constitutes substantial part of substratum of the impugned preventive detention order is Crime No.84 of 2023 on the file of Devipattinam Police Station, for alleged offences under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 324 and 302 of 'Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Act 45 of 1860)' ['IPC' for brevity]. 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 final hearing today, learned counsel predicated his campaign against the impugned preventive detention order on the point that the detenu was arrested on 27.03.2023 but the impugned preventive detention order has been made only on 31.05.2023 resulting in live and proximate link between grounds and purpose of detention getting



snapped.

WEB COPY

9. Mr.Thiruvadi Kumar, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor, submits that materials had to be collected and time was consumed in this exercise.

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 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 first adverse case is in Crime No.24 of 2020 on the file of Devipattinam Police Station for alleged offences under Sections 294(b), 323 of IPC and Section 4 of TNPHW Act, 2002 [alleged occurrence on 01.02.2020], second adverse case is Crime No.130 of 2021 on the file of Devipattinam Police Station for alleged offences under Section 341, 294(b) and 324 of IPC [alleged occurrence on 15.04.2021], third adverse case is Crime No.170 of 2022 on the file of Devipattinam Police Station for alleged offences under Section 387 of IPC [alleged occurrence on 06.08.2022]; fourth adverse case is Crime No.360 of 2021



HCP(MD)No.938 of 2023

on the file of Devipattinam Police Station for alleged offences under Sections 294(b), 324 and 506(ii) of IPC [alleged occurrence on 19.10.2019], ground case is Crime No.84 of 2023 on the file of Devipattinam Police Station, for alleged offences under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 324 and 302 of [alleged occurrence on 26.03.2023] and therefore time consumed remains unexplained.

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 31.05.2023 bearing reference in S.R.No. 01/Goonda/2023 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Pallu Bala @ Balamurugan, aged about 34 years, son of Thiru.Selvam, 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

Index : Yes  
Neutral Citation : Yes  
PKN

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



HCP(MD)No.938 of 2023

To

WEB COPY

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,  
Ramanathapuram District, Ramanathapuram.
3. The Superintendent,  
Central Prison,  
Madurai.
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,  
Madurai.
5. The Joint Secretary to Government,  
Public (Law and Order) Department,  
Secretariat, Chennai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.938 of 2023

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

PKN

**ORDER MADE IN**  
**HCP(MD)No.938 of 2023**

**DATED : 30.10.2023**