



HCP(MD)No.1226 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 09.11.2023

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.SUNDAR

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SAKTHIVEL

H.C.P.(MD)No.1226 of 2023

Kaliyamoorthy

: Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Principal Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 09.

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

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Tiruchirappalli 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 records pertaining to

Page 1 of 10



HCP(MD)No.1226 of 2023

the impugned detention order passed by the second respondent made in his proceedings in P.D.No.41/2023 dated 08.07.2023 in detaining the detenu under Section 3(1) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 as a Goonda and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the Detenu namely Sundar, son of Kaliyamoorthy, Male aged about 29 years, who is detained in Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.U.Mohamed Aslam

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar

Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

[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 09.10.2023, a Hon'ble Predecessor Coordinate Division Bench made the following order and a scanned reproduction of the same is as follows:



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1226 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, captioned matter is in the Final Hearing Board.

4.Mr.M.U.Mohamed Aslam, 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 father of the detenu assailing a 'preventive detention order dated 08.07.2023 bearing



HCP(MD)No.1226 of 2023

reference P.D.No.41/2023' [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 'Thiruppanandal Police Station, (Incharge) Thiruneelagudi 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.

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 are two adverse cases and one ground case. The ground case which constitutes substantial part of substratum of the impugned preventive detention order is Crime No.387 of 2023 on the file of



HCP(MD)No.1226 of 2023

Thiruneelagudi Police Station for alleged offences under Sections 294(b), 324, 506(ii) and 302 of 'The Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860)' [hereinafter 'IPC' for the sake of convenience and clarity] and subsequently altered into Sections 147, 148, 120(B), 294(b), 324, 302 and 506(ii) 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 28.05.2023 but the impugned preventive detention order has been made only on 08.07.2023 resulting in 'live and proximate link' between grounds of detention and purpose of detention getting snapped.

9.Mr.A.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.



WEB COPY

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



HCP(MD)No.1226 of 2023

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 adverse cases are in Crime No.655 of 2020 on the file of Thiruneelagudi Police Station (occurrence was on 30.06.2020) and in Crime No.912 of 2021 on the file of Thiruppanandal Police Station (occurrence was on 14.12.2021) 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 08.07.2023 bearing reference P.D.No.41/2023 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Sundar, aged 29 years, son of Thiru.Kaliyamoorthy, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, if not required in connection



HCP(MD)No.1226 of 2023

with any other case / cases. There shall be no order as to costs.

WEB COPY

[M.S.,J.] & [R.S.V.,J.]

09.11.2023

Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes/No

Neutral Citation : Yes/No

MR

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



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1226 of 2023

To

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 09.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thanjavur District,
Thanjavur.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Tiruchirappalli Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1226 of 2023

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

MR

ORDER MADE IN
H.C.P.(MD)No.1226 of 2023

09.11.2023