



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1434 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 10.11.2023

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.S.SUNDAR
AND
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.1434 of 2023

Thavamani
W/o Ganesan

..

Petitioner

v.

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat, Fort St.George
Chennai 600 009

2. The Commissioner of Police/Detaining Authority
Tiruppur, Tiruppur District

3. The Superintendent
Central Prison, Coimbatore
Coimbatore District

4. The Inspector of Police
Tiruppur South Police Station
Thiruppur, Thiruppur District

..

Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India,



H.C.P.No.1434 of 2023

praying for issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records in C.No.24/G/IS/Tiruppur City/2023 on the file of the second respondent, quash the detention order dated 12.06.2023 and direct the production of the detenu of the petitioner's son Kamalraj, Son of Ganesan, presently detained at the Central Prison, Coimbatore as a Goonda under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner :: Mr.P.Stalin Selvasekaran

For Respondents :: Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor
assisted by Mr.C.Aravind, Advocate

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by S.S.SUNDAR,J.)

The petitioner, who is the mother of the detenu, namely, Kamalraj, aged 22 years, S/o Ganesan, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 12.06.2023 slapped on her son, branding him as 'Goonda' under 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



H.C.P.No.1434 of 2023

(Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982).

WEB COPY

2. Heard the learned counsel appearing 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 appearing for the petitioner confined his argument to the point that the detaining authority has relied upon the bail order passed in CrI.M.P.No.1159 of 2021 dated 28.07.2021 by the Principal Sessions Court, Tiruppur in respect of the accused therein, which is not similar to the offence alleged against the detenu in the ground case, as the bail was granted to the accused in similar case for the offence under Sections 328, 284 of IPC and Section 24(1) of the Cigarette and other Tobacco Products Act, 2003. The learned counsel pointed out that the detenu herein has been charged for the offence under Sections 294(b), 328, 506(ii) of IPC read with Section 22(a) of the Cigarette and other Tobacco Products Act, 2003 in the ground case. Therefore, the detention order is liable to be set aside on the sole ground that the subjective satisfaction of the detaining authority



suffers from non-application of mind.

WEB COPY

4. This Court perused page-379 of the booklet and is convinced with the statement of the learned counsel for petitioner that the bail was granted to the accused in the alleged similar case for the offence under Sections 328, 284 of IPC and Section 24(1) of the Cigarette and other Tobacco Products Act, 2003. Whereas, in the case on hand, the detenu has been charged for the offence under Sections 294(b), 328, 506(ii) of IPC read with Section 22(a) of the Cigarette and other Tobacco Products Act, 2003 in the ground case. It is also admitted that there are three adverse cases against the detenu. Therefore, the subjective satisfaction of the detaining authority suffers from non-application of mind. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Rekha v. State of Tamil Nadu through Secretary to Government and another, (2011) 5 SCC 244***, has held that in case any of the reasons stated in the order of detention is non-existent or a material information is wrongly assumed, that will 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



H.C.P.No.1434 of 2023

relevant to extract paragraph Nos.10 and 11 of the said judgment of the

WEB CO Hon'ble Supreme Court, as follows:-

“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 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



H.C.P.No.1434 of 2023

*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."*

In view of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Rekha's case, this Court finds that the impugned order is liable to be quashed.

5. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 12.06.2023 in C.No.24/G/IS/Tiruppur City/2023 is hereby set aside and the habeas corpus petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Kamalraj, S/o Ganesan, aged 22 years, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case.

Index : yes/no
Neutral citation : yes/no

(S.S.S.R.,J.) (S.M.,J.)
10.11.2023

SS

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat, Fort St.George
Chennai 600 009



H.C.P.No.1434 of 2023

2. The Commissioner of Police/Detaining Authority
Tiruppur City, Tiruppur District

3. The Superintendent
Central Prison, Coimbatore
Coimbatore District

4. The Inspector of Police
Tiruppur South Police Station
Thiruppur, Thiruppur District

5. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1434 of 2023

S.S.SUNDAR,J.

AND

SUNDER MOHAN,J.

SS

H.C.P.No.1434 of 2023

10.11.2023