



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1371/2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 21.11.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR . JUSTICE S.S.SUNDAR

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.1371/2023

Yasmeen

..

Petitioner

Versus

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu rep.by its
Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St George, Chennai.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate
Chengalpattu District, Chengalpattu.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police
Chengalpattu District, Chengalpattu.
- 4.The Superintendent or Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai-600 066.
- 5.The Inspector of Police
Thirukazhukundram Police Station
Thirukazhukundram, Chengalpattu District.

..

Respondents



HCP.No.1371/2023

WEB COPY

Prayer:- Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for a Writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the entire records leading to the detention of the petitioner's husband Mansur Alikhan son of Abdhul Kani, male, aged about 31 years is presently lodged in the Central Prison, puzhal, at Chennai and has been detained under Act 14 of 1982 as a "Goonda" vide detention order dated 21.06.2023 made in CPT No.36/2023 by the 2nd respondent, the District Collector and District Magistrate, Chengalpattu District, Chengalpattu and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the body and person of the said detenu before this Court and thereafter set him at liberty from the Central Prison, Puzhal, at Chennai.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Rajavelu
For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor
assisted by Mr.C.Aravind

ORDER

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

(1)The petitioner, wife of the detenu herein, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 21.06.2023 slapped on her husband, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982.



HCP.No.1371/2023

WEB COPY

(2) Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

(3) Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the bail order in the similar case relied on by the Detaining Authority to arrive at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail, was obtained during COVID-19 situation and that placing reliance on such order shows the non-application of mind on the part of the Detaining Authority.

(4) On a perusal of the Grounds of Detention, it is seen that the Detaining Authority had relied upon the orders of bail in similar case in CrI.MP.No.3571/2020 passed by the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge, Chengalpattu. However, in the Booklet, it is seen that the bail order in the similar case was obtained during COVID-19 situation and bail was granted to the accused therein with a specific reference to COVID-19. It is in the said circumstances, this Court finds that the subjective satisfaction arrived at by the Detaining Authority to hold that the detenu is likely to be released on bail, suffers from non-application of mind.



HCP.No.1371/2023

WEB COPY

(5)The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the case of ***Rekha Vs. State of Tamil Nadu through Secretary to Government and Another*** reported in ***2011 [5] SCC 244***, has considered a case where it is stated that in the grounds of detention that relatives of detenu are taking action to take him on bail in the criminal case in which the detenu was in remand and that in similar case, bail was granted by Courts. Since no details had been given about the alleged similar cases in which bail was allegedly granted by the Court concerned, it is held by Hon'ble Supreme Court that in the absence of details, the statement which is mere *ipse dixit*, cannot be relied upon and that itself is sufficient to vitiate the detention order. When the subjective satisfaction was irrational or there was non-application of mind, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that the order of detention is liable to be quashed. It is relevant to extract paragraphs No.10 and 11 of the said judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court:-

"10. In our opinion, if details are given by the respondent authority about the alleged bail orders in similar cases mentioning the date of the orders, the bail application number, whether the bail order was passed in respect of the co-accused in the same case, and



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1371/2023

whether the case of the co-accused was on the same footing as the case of the petitioner, then, of course, it could be argued that there is likelihood of the accused being released on bail, because it is the normal practice of most courts that if a co-accused has been granted bail and his case is on the same footing as that of the petitioner, then the petitioner is ordinarily granted bail. However, the respondent authority should have given details about the alleged bail order in similar cases, which has not been done in the present case. A mere ipse dixit statement in the grounds of detention cannot sustain the detention order and has to be ignored.

11. In our opinion, the detention order in question only contains ipse dixit regarding the alleged imminent possibility of the accused coming out on bail and there was no reliable material to this effect. Hence, the detention order in question cannot be sustained."

(6) In view of the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 21.06.2023 in CPT.No.36/2023 is hereby set aside and



HCP.No.1371/2023

WEB COPY

the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless he is required in connection with any other case.

[S.S.S.R., J.] [S.M, J.]
21.11.2023

AP
Internet: Yes



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1371/2023

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government
State of Tamil Nadu
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St George, Chennai.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate
Chengalpattu District, Chengalpattu.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police
Chengalpattu District, Chengalpattu.
- 4.The Superintendent or Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai-600 066.
- 5.The Inspector of Police
Thirukazhukundram Police Station
Thirukazhukundram, Chengalpattu District.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1371/2023

S.S.SUNDAR, J.,
AND
SUNDER MOHAN, J.,

AP

H.C.P.No.1371/2023

21.11.2023