

**BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT**

DATED: 16.05.2017

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.V.MURALIDARAN
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.V.KARTHIKEYAN

H.C.P(MD)No.91 of 2017

Karthik

: 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 the District Collector,
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector,
Virudhunagar District.

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

: Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the entire records connected with the detention order of the respondent No.2 in Cr.M.P.No.01/2017 (Goonda) dated 11.01.2017 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Karthik, son of (late) Jeyamuniyasamy, aged about 26 years, now detained at Madurai Central Prison before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Alagumani

For Respondents : Mr.C.Ramesh,
Additional Public Prosecutor.**O R D E R**[Order of the Court was made by **M.V.MURALIDARAN, J.**]

The petitioner is the the detenu - Karthik, son of (late) Jeyamuniyasamy, aged about 26 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Cr.M.P.No.01/2017, dated 11.01.2017, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(1) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.



2. We have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondents. We have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.

3. Though many grounds have been raised in the petition, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has restricted his contention by contending that there is no real possibility for the detenu to come out on bail, as he has not filed any bail petition till today.

4. While referring to the order of detention passed by the detaining authority, the learned counsel for the petitioner, referred to paragraph - 5 of the order of detention, wherein the detaining authority would state that in a similar Section of case, bail has been granted to another accused in another crime number. Therefore, there is a real possibility of the detenu coming out on bail. This according to the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner is bereft of particulars without cogent materials, which vitiates the impugned order of detention. In support of his contention, he relies on the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court reported in 2012 (7) Supreme Court Cases 181 (Huidrom Konungjao Singh v. State of Manipur).

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor on behalf of the second respondent would submit that the order of detention has been passed in due consideration of fact and law with a view to curtail his prejudicial activities and to maintain public order, and therefore, it does not warrant interference by this Court.

6. As rightly contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that in this case, bail has been granted to co-accused and the subjective satisfaction arrived at by the detaining authority that there is real possibility of his coming out on bail would be a mere ipse dixit and that would vitiate the order of detention. It is trite law that when no bail application is pending, then it is only a logical conclusion that there is no likelihood of the person in custody would be released on bail. In the ground case, no bail application has been filed. If that be so, there are no cogent materials available before the detaining authority to come to the satisfaction that there is real possibility of the detenu coming out on bail. This would be indicative of the non-application of mind and it is only an expression of the impression made by the authority without any material whatsoever. Therefore, the impugned order is passed on mere Ipse-dixit and the order of detention cannot be sustained in the eye of law. In this connection, it is useful to refer the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court relied on by the learned counsel for the petitioner reported in 2012 (7) Supreme Court Cases 181 (Huidrom Konungjao Singh v. State of Manipur), wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court has held as follows:



(emphasis added) ""

15. In the instant case, admittedly, the said bail orders do not relate to the co-accused in the same case. The accused released in those cases on bail had no concern with the present case. Merely, because somebody else in similar cases had been granted bail, there could be no presumption that in the instant case had the detenu applied for bail could have been released on bail. Thus, as the detenu in the instant case has not moved the bail application and no other co-accused, if any had been enlarged on bail, resorting to the provisions of the Act was not permissible. Therefore, the impugned order of detention is based on mere ipse dixit statement in the grounds of detention and cannot be sustained in the eye of the law".

7. In the light of the above fact and law, we have no hesitation in quashing the order of detention passed by the detaining authority.

8. In the result, the Detention Order, passed by the second respondent, in his proceedings in Cr.M.P.No.01/2017, dated 11.01.2017, is quashed. The detenu, namely, Karthik, son of late ~~Seivaran~~^{Seyyuran}, aged about 26 years is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith, if he is not required for detention in connection with any other case.



9. In the upshot, we allow the Habeas Corpus Petition.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (Records)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

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 the District Collector,
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector,
Virudhunagar District.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Madurai Central Prison,
Madurai District.
4. The Joint Secretary to Government Public (Law & Order),
Fort saint George,
Chennai-9.
5. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

ORDER MADE IN
H.C.P (MD) No.91 of 2017
Dated:16.05.2017

SDS/MMS/SAR 1/24.05.2017/4P/6C