



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2567 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 23..12..2022

Coram

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

Habeas Corpus Petition No.2567 of 2022

Kishori Rai
Son of Devnarayan Ray

..... Petitioner

-Versus-

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by The Chief Secretary,
Department of Home, Prohibition and Excise,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai 600009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Thiruppur District,
Thiruppur.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Thiruppur District,
Thiruppur.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Coimbatore.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Palladam Police Station,
Palladam, Thiruppur District.



H.C.P.No.2567 of 2022

.... Respondents

WEB COPY Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records of the the 2nd respondent in detention order in CMP No.11/Goonda/2022 dated 12.02.2022 passed by the 2nd respondent under Tn act 14/82 and set aside the same and also direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's son viz., Rajukumar, aged 22 years, son of Kishori Rai, now confined in Central Prison Coimbatore before this court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Thiyagarajan

*For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj,
Additional Public Prosecutor*

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the father of the detenu viz., Rajukumar, son of Kishori Rai. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in CMP No.11/Goonda/2022 dated 12.02.2022, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) 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 have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.

3. The main ground that was urged by the learned counsel for the appellant is that detaining authority after being aware of the fact that the detenu has not moved any bail application, without any material, came to a conclusion that there is likelihood of his coming out of bail.

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 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.

6. 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 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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2567 of 2022

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.”

7. 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



H.C.P.No.2567 of 2022

non application of mind on the part of the detaining authority.

WEB COPY 8. 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 CMP No.11/Goonda/2022 dated 12.02.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu viz., Rajukumar, son of Kishori Rai, 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.)
23..12..2022

Index: Yes/No
kmk



H.C.P.No.2567 of 2022

To

WEB COPY

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by The Chief Secretary,
Department of Home, Prohibition and Excise,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai 600009.
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Thiruppur District,
Thiruppur.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Thiruppur District,
Thiruppur.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Coimbatore.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Palladam Police Station,
Palladam, Thiruppur 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.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2567 of 2022

P.N.PRAKASH.J.,
AND
N.ANAND VENKATESH.J.,

kmk

H.C.P.No.2567 of 2022

23..12..2022

Page 8 of 8