



H.C.P.No.1450 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED: 20..12..2022

Coram

The Honourable Mr. Justice **P.N.PRAKASH**
and
The Honourable Mr. Justice **N.ANAND VENKATESH**

Habeas Corpus Petition No.1450 of 2022

Sollammadevi

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamilnadu
Rep. by the Secretary,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai – 600 009.

2. The District Collector,
The District Collector Office,
Nagappatinam District.

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

4. The Inspector of Police,
Velankanni Police Station,
Nagapattinam District.

... Respondents



H.C.P.No.1450 of 2022

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records relating to the detention order in Memo C.O.C.No.25/2022, dated 21.05.2022 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamilnadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondent to produce the petitioner's husband Seval @ Packirisamy S/o Duraisamy aged about 40 years the detenu, now confined at Central Prison, Trichy before this Court and set the petitioner's husband Seval @ Packirisamy S/o. Duraisamy aged about 40 years the detenu herein at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Gopikrishnan

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by P.N.PRAKASH.J.,]

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu viz., Seval @ Packirisamy S/o Duraisamy. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C.O.C.No.25/2022, dated 21.05.2022 holding him to be a "Bootlegger", as contemplated under Section 2(b) 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 appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents. We



H.C.P.No.1450 of 2022

have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.

WEB COPY

3. Though several grounds have been raised in the Habeas Corpus Petition, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner mainly contended that the bail petition filed by the petitioner in CrI.M.P.No.2446 of 2022 was dismissed on the same day i.e., on 13.05.2022 by the learned Judicial Magistrate-I, Nagapattinam, yet, the detaining authority came to a conclusion that there is a real and imminent possibility of the detenu coming out on bail by filing a further bail petition and hence, it is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the subjective satisfaction that has been arrived at by the detaining authority at Paragraph No.6 of the order is not supported by any materials. Therefore, the same also suffers from non application of mind.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner, in order to substantiate the submissions, relied upon the judgment of the Full Bench reported in **2005 (2) LW 946 [K.Thirupathi v. District Magistrate and District Collector, Tiruchirappalli District & another]**.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor strongly opposed the Habeas Corpus Petition by filing his counter.



WEB COPY

6. The satisfaction that has been arrived at by the detaining authority is merely on surmises and it is not based on any material that has been placed before the detaining authority. At this point of time, it will be relevant to take note of the Full Bench judgment, which has been referred supra.

7. The relevant portions are extracted hereunder:

“24. The detaining authority is required to follow strictly and scrupulously the forms and rules of law prescribed in that behalf or by the statutory provision under which the order of detention is being made after arriving at a subjective satisfaction. In the event of any deviation or violation of the statutory provisions or infraction of constitutional guarantees, the Courts will not hesitate to quash the orders of detention. Whatever be the jurisdiction to detain and the slightest infraction of the constitutional guarantee would lead to the detenu being set at liberty.

25. It is by now well settled that in all detention laws, the orders of detention and its continuance of detention should be in conformity with Article 22 of the Constitution of India and slightest infraction of the



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1450 of 2022

Constitutional protection enshrined therein would be a valid ground to set the detenu at liberty.

26. There must be cogent material before the Authority passing the detention order for inferring that the detenu was likely to be released on bail. This inference must be drawn from material on record and must not be the ipse dixit of the Authority passing the detention order.

27. In the case of a person in custody a detention order can validly be passed if the authority passing the order is aware of the fact that he is actually in custody; if he has reason to believe on the basis of reliable material placed before him--

(a) that there is a real possibility of his being released on bail, and

(b) if it is felt essential to detain him to prevent him from so doing. If the authority passes an order after recording its satisfaction in this behalf, such an order cannot be struck down on the ground that the proper course for the authority was to oppose the bail and if bail is granted notwithstanding such opposition to question it before a higher Court.

28. It is neither possible nor advisable catalogue the types of materials which can form the basis of a



detention order under the Act. That will depend on the facts and situation of a case. That is why there is no provision in the Act in that regard and the matter is left to the discretion of the detaining authority. However, the facts stated in the materials relied upon should be true and should have a reasonable nexus with the purpose for which the order is passed.”

8. It is clear from the above that the detenu is in custody and he has not filed any bail petition and there are no materials to show that he is taking steps to file a bail petition by himself or through his relatives or it was based merely on the presumption made by the detaining authority, the same reflects non application of mind on the part of the detaining authority.

9. In view of the above, the detention order suffers from non application of mind and the same is liable to be interfered with by this Court. The impugned detention order is, therefore, liable to be quashed.

In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in C.O.C.No.25/2022, dated 21.05.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu viz., Seval @ Packirisamy S/o



H.C.P.No.1450 of 2022

Duraisamy, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

(P.N.P., J.) (N.A.V.,J.)
20..12..2022

Index: Yes/No
kmk

To

- 1.State of Tamilnadu
Rep. by the Secretary,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai – 600 009.
2. The District Collector,
The District Collector Office,
Nagappatinam District.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Trichy,
Trichy District.
4. The Inspector of Police,
Velankanni Police Station,
Nagapattinam District.
- 6.The Joint Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Public, Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 9.
- 7.The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.

P.N.PRAKASH.J.,



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1450 of 2022

AND
N.ANAND VENKATESH.J.,

kmk

H.C.P.No.1450 of 2022

20..12..2022