



HCP.No.1682/2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 06.11.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR . JUSTICE S.S.SUNDAR

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.1682/2023

Vallimayil

..

Petitioner

Versus

1.The State of Tamil Nadu rep.by its
Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St George, Chennai 600 009.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate
Mayiladuthurai District, Mayiladuthurai.

3.The Superintendent of Police
Mayiladuthurai District, Mayiladuthurai.

4.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Trichirappalli.

5.The Inspector of Police
Sirkazhi Police Station
Mayiladuthurai District.

..

Respondents



HCP.No.1682/2023

Prayer:- Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for a Writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records relating to the detention order dated 05.06.2023 passed by the 2nd respondent in his proceeding No.COC.No.28/2023 and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce petitioner's son namely Suriyaprakash son of late Kumar aged about 22 years who is presently undergoing detention in the Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli, as Bootlegger before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Vinoth

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, mother of the detenu herein, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 05.06.2023 slapped on her son, branding him as "Bootlegger" under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982.

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



HCP.No.1682/2023

WEB COPY

(3) Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the bail orders in the similar cases relied on by the Detaining Authority to arrive at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail, were obtained during COVID-19 situation and that placing reliance on such orders 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 cases in CrI.MP.Nos.1011/2022 & 530/2022 passed by the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge, Nagapattinam. However, in pages No.89 and 97 of the Booklet, it is seen that the bail orders in the similar cases were 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.

(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



HCP.No.1682/2023

WEB COPY

[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 cases, 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 whether the case of the co-accused was on the same footing as the case of the petitioner, then, of course, it



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1682/2023

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 the instant case, the Detaining Authority has arrived at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail by referring to bail orders granted in similar cases in CrI.MP.Nos.1011/2022 & 530/2022. From the reading of the said bail orders it is seen that the bail was granted only by taking note of COVID-19 situation and therefore, the



HCP.No.1682/2023

WEB COPY

subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority that the detenu is likely to be released on bail, suffers from non-application of mind. Hence, on the above ground, the Detention Order is liable to be quashed.

(7) In view of the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 05.06.2023 in COC.No.28/2023 is hereby set aside and 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.]
06.11.2023

AP
Internet: Yes



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1682/2023

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government
State of Tamil Nadu
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St George, Chennai 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate
Mayiladuthurai District, Mayiladuthurai.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police
Mayiladuthurai District, Mayiladuthurai.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Trichirappalli.
- 5.The Inspector of Police
Sirkazhi Police Station
Mayiladuthurai District.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1682/2023

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

AP

H.C.P.No.1682/2023

06.11.2023