



HCP(MD)No.921 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

H.C.P.(MD)No.921 of 2023

Anjalai

: Petitioner

Vs.

1.Government of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. By its the Additional Chief Secretary
to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.

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

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.

: Respondents

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 2nd respondent in Detention Order No.31/2023 dated 30.05.2023 and detained at Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of



HCP(MD)No.921 of 2023

petitioner's son namely Maniraj, Male aged about 25/2023 Son of Rengasamy, now confined at Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli and set him at liberty forthwith.


For Petitioner : Mr.B.Jameelarasu

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 25.07.2023, a Hon'ble Coordinate Division Bench made the following order in the Admission Board:





HCP(MD)No.921 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.B.Jameelarasu, learned counsel on record for petitioner and Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor for all respondents are before us.

5. Captioned HCP has been filed by the mother of the detenu assailing a 'preventive detention order dated 30.05.2023 bearing P.D.No. 31/2023' [hereinafter 'impugned preventive detention order' for the sake of brevity and convenience]. To be noted, sponsoring authority has not been arrayed as a respondent but we find that 'Station House Officer of Vattathikkottai Police Station' is the sponsoring authority [hereinafter 'Sponsoring Authority' for the sake of convenience and clarity] and second respondent is the detaining authority as impugned preventive detention order has been made by second respondent.



WEB COPY

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.225 of 2023 on the file of Vattathikkottai Police Station registered under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 324 and 307 of 'The Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860)' [hereinafter 'IPC' for the sake of convenience and clarity] read with Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s), 3(2)(va) of 'Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Amendment Act, 2015' [hereinafter 'SC/ST (POA) Act' for the sake of convenience and clarity], which was subsequently altered into Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 324, 307 and 302 IPC read with Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s), 3(2)(v) of SC/ST (POA) Act.



HCP(MD)No.921 of 2023

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 31.03.2023 but the impugned preventive detention order has been made only on 30.05.2023 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



HCP(MD)No.921 of 2023

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



HCP(MD)No.921 of 2023

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.225 of 2023 on the file of Dindigul Taluk Police Station registered under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 324 and 307 of IPC read with Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s), 3(2)(va) of SC/ST (POA) Act, which was subsequently altered into Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 324, 307 and 302 IPC read with Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s), 3(2)(v) of SC/ST (POA) Act 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 30.05.2023 bearing reference P.D.No. 31/2023 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Maniraj, male, aged 25 years, son of Thiru.Rengasamy, is directed to



HCP(MD)No.921 of 2023

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
Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli.***



HCP(MD)No.921 of 2023

WEB COPY

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thanjavur District, Thanjavur.
3. The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.921 of 2023

M.SUNDAR, J.

and

R.SAKTHIVEL, J.

vsm

H.C.P.(MD)No.921 of 2023

30.10.2023