



HCP(MD)No.1352 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 06.12.2023

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.SUNDAR

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SAKTHIVEL

H.C.P.(MD)No.1352 of 2023

S.Meshwin

: Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, George Fort,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Madurai City,
Madurai.

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

: Respondents



HCP(MD)No.1352 of 2023

WEB COPY

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records on the file of the second respondent in No.34/BCDFGISSSV/2023 dated 24.04.2023 and set aside the order of detention passed therein; direct the respondents to produce the detenue by name Dineshkumar @ Maadu Dinesh, Male, aged 27 years, S/o.Sureshkumar before this Court, now detained at Central Prison, Madurai and set aside the order of detention passed therein and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.Srikanth
for Mr.J.William Christopher
For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

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

Captioned 'Habeas Corpus Petition' ['HCP' for the sake of brevity] was listed before this Bench in the Admission Board on 07.11.2023 and this Bench made the following order:



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1352 of 2023

' H.C.P.(MD)No.1352 of 2023

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

O R D E R

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

Captioned Habeas Corpus Petition has been filed in this Court on 01.11.2023 inter alia assailing a 'detention order dated 24.04.2023, bearing reference No. 34/BCDFGISSSV/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, the mother of the detenu is the petitioner.

3.Mr.Srikanth, learned Counsel representing the Counsel on record for petitioner is before us. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that ground case qua the detenu is for alleged offences under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 341, 342, 302 and 506(ii) of 'the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Act 45 of 1860)' [hereinafter 'IPC' for the sake of brevity] and altered into Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 341, 342, 302, 506(ii) and 102-B in Crime No.69 of 2023 on the file of B6 Jaihindpuram Police Station.

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



HCP(MD)No.1352 of 2023

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 a similar case bail order relied on in the grounds booklet furnished to the detenu is not similar in nature.*

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

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

2.As the aforementioned Admission Board order captures all essentials ie., essentials imperative for appreciating this final order we refrain from setting out the facts again. Suffice to say that the aforementioned Admission Board order dated 07.11.2023 shall now be read as an integral part and parcel of this final order. This also means that the short forms, abbreviations and short references used in the Admission Board order will continue to be used in the instant final order also for the sake of convenience and clarity.

3.There is no adverse case. The ground case which constitutes sole substratum of the impugned preventive detention order is Crime No.69 of 2023 on the file of B6 Jaihindpuram Police Station for the



HCP(MD)No.1352 of 2023

alleged offences under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 341, 342, 302 and 506(ii) of IPC which was subsequently altered into Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 341, 342, 302, 506(ii) and 120-B 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.

4.Mr.Srikanth, learned counsel representing the Counsel on record for petitioner and Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor for all respondents are before us.

5.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 02.02.2023 but the impugned preventive detention order has been made only on 24.04.2023 resulting in live and proximate link between grounds and purpose of detention getting snapped.

6.Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor, submits to the contrary by saying that materials had to be



HCP(MD)No.1352 of 2023

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.

7.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.



HCP(MD)No.1352 of 2023

8.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.**

9.To be noted, the impugned preventive detention order is predicated on a solitary case viz., Crime No.69 of 2023 on the file of B6 Jaihindpuram Police Station for the alleged offences under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 341, 342, 302 and 506(ii) of IPC which was subsequently altered into Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 341, 342, 302, 506(ii) and 120-B of IPC and therefore this solitary case is the sole substratum of the impugned preventive detention order.



HCP(MD)No.1352 of 2023

WEB COPY

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

11.Ergo, the sequitur is, captioned HCP is allowed. Impugned preventive detention order dated 24.04.2023 bearing reference No. 34/BCDFGISSSV/2023 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Dineshkumar @ Maadu Dinesh, male, aged 27 years, son of Sureshkumar, 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.]

06.12.2023

Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes/No

Neutral Citation : Yes/No

MR

Post Script: Registry to forthwith communicate this order to Jail authorities in Central Prison, Madurai. All concerned are 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.



HCP(MD)No.1352 of 2023

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Secretariat,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tiruchirappalli District,
Tiruchirappalli.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Trichy Central Prison,
Trichy District.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1352 of 2023

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

MR

ORDER MADE IN
H.C.P.(MD)No.1352 of 2023

06.12.2023