



H.C.P(MD)No.1238 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: **15.11.2023**

Coram

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

H.C.P(MD)No.1238 of 2023

Chinnammal

.. Petitioner

VS

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

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

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Madurai.

.. Respondents

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 with the detention order of the respondent No.2 in Detention Order No.66/2023 dated 05.09.2023 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu by name Ranjithkumar, son of Nagappan aged about 25 years, now detained at Madurai Central Prison, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.



H.C.P(MD)No.1238 of 2023

WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Praveenkumar
For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

Captioned 'Habeas Corpus Petition' [hereinafter 'HCP' for the sake of brevity, convenience and clarity] was listed in the Admission Board before us on 12.10.2023 and we made the following order:

H.C.P(MD)No.1238 of 2023

H.C.P.[MD]No.1238 of 2023

M.SUNDAR, J.

and

R.SAKTHIVEL, J.

ORDER

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

Captioned Habeas Corpus Petition has been filed in this Court on 09.10.2023 *inter alia* assailing a 'detention order dated 05.09.2023, bearing Detention Order No.66/2023' [hereinafter 'impugned preventive detention order' for the sake of convenience, clarity and brevity] made by 'second respondent' [hereinafter 'Detaining Authority' for the sake of convenience].

2. To be noted, mother of the detenu is the petitioner.

3. Mr.P.Praveenkumar, learned counsel on record for petitioner is before us. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that ground case *qua* the detenu is Crime No.439 of 2023 on the file of Dindigul Taluk Police Station for alleged offences under Sections 147, 148, 449, 294(b), and



WEB COPY



H.C.P(MD)No.1238 of 2023

302 of 'the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Act 45 of 1860)' [hereinafter 'IPC' for the sake of brevity] and subsequently altered into Sections 120(B), 147, 148, 449, 294(b) and 302 IPC .

4. The aforementioned impugned preventive detention order has been made on the premise that the detenu is a 'Goonda' under Section 2(f) of '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].

5. The impugned preventive detention order has been assailed *inter alia* on the ground that some of the pages found in the grounds booklet are illegible and though the detenu requested for typed copy of those illegible pages, the same were not furnished which prevented the detenu from making a proper representation.

H.C.P(MD)No.1238 of 2023

6. *Prima facie* case made out for admission. Admit. Issue *Rule nisi* returnable by four [4] weeks.

7. Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, State of Tamil Nadu accepts notice for all respondents. List the captioned Habeas Corpus Petition accordingly.


[M.S., J.] & [R.S.V., J.]
12.10.2023

vsm

2. The aforementioned Admission Board order captures all essentials that are imperative for appreciating this order and we would plunge into the legal drill of testing the impugned preventive detention order in the habeas legal drill on hand. Suffice to say that aforementioned Admission Board order dated 12.10.2023 shall now be read as an integral part and parcel of



H.C.P(MD)No.1238 of 2023

WEB COPY
this final order. It means that the short forms, short references and abbreviations used in the Admission Board order will continue to be used in the instant final order also.

3. Mr.P.Praveenkumar, learned counsel on record for petitioner and Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor for all respondents are before us.

4. Captioned HCP has been filed by mother of the detenu assailing the impugned preventive detention order. To be noted, sponsoring authority has not been arrayed as a respondent but we find that Station House Officer of 'Dindigul Taluk Police Station' is the sponsoring authority [hereinafter 'Sponsoring Authority' for the sake of convenience and clarity].

5. There is no adverse case. The ground case which constitutes sole substratum of the impugned preventive detention order is Crime No.439 of 2023 on the file of Dindigul Taluk Police Station for the alleged offences under Sections 147, 148, 449, 294(b) and 302 of 'The Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860)' [hereinafter 'IPC' for the sake of convenience and clarity] and subsequently altered into Sections 120-B, 147, 148, 449, 294(b) and 302 of



H.C.P(MD)No.1238 of 2023

IPC. Considering the nature of the challenge to the impugned preventive detention order, it is not necessary to delve into the factual matrix of the case.

6. In the final hearing today, learned counsel predicated his campaign against the impugned preventive detention order on the point that the detenu was surrendered on 08.08.2023 but the impugned preventive detention order has been made only on 05.09.2023 resulting in live and proximate link between grounds and purpose of detention getting snapped.

7. Mr.Thiruvadi Kumar, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor, submits that materials had to be collected and time was consumed in this exercise. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and nature of ground case, we find that this explanation of learned State Additional Public Prosecutor is unacceptable.

8. 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,



H.C.P(MD)No.1238 of 2023

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.

9. 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.



H.C.P(MD)No.1238 of 2023

10. To be noted, the impugned preventive detention order is predicated on a solitary case viz., Crime No.439 of 2023 on the file of Dindigul Taluk Police Station, for alleged offences under Sections 147, 148, 449, 294(b), 302 of IPC and subsequently altered into Sections 120-B, 147, 148, 449, 294(b) and 302 of IPC and therefore this solitary case is the sole substratum of the impugned preventive detention order.

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

12. Ergo, the sequitur is, captioned HCP is allowed. Impugned preventive detention order dated 05.09.2023 bearing Detention Order No. 66/2023 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Ranjithkumar, aged 25 years, son of Nagappan, 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.)
15.11.2023

Index : Yes
Neutral Citation : Yes

PKN



H.C.P(MD)No.1238 of 2023

P.S: Registry to forthwith communicate this order to Jail authorities in Central Prison, Madurai. All concerned to act on this order being uploaded in official website of this Court without insisting on certified 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.1238 of 2023

WEB COPY

- To
- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.
 - 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Dindigul District, Dindigul.
 - 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
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



H.C.P(MD)No.1238 of 2023

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

PKN

H.C.P(MD)No.1238 of 2023

15.11.2023