



HCP.No.1801/2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 19.12.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR . JUSTICE S.S.SUNDAR

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.1801/2023

A.Ramani

..

Petitioner

Versus

1.State of Tamil Nadu rep.by

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

2.The Commissioner of Police

Vepery, Chennai.

3.The Superintendent of Police

Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai.

4.The Inspector of Police

V1 Villivakkam Police Station
Chennai District.

..

Respondents



HCP.No.1801/2023

Prayer:- Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for a Writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records of the 2nd respondent pertaining to the order made in No.348/BCDFGISSSV/2023 dated 09.08.2023 in detaining the detenu under the Tamil nadu Act 14 of 1982 as Gondas and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu namely, Alexander, M/A 29, son of Samuvel who is detained at the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set him at liberty.

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

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 09.08.2023 slapped on her husband, branding her as "Goonda" 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.
- (3)Though several points have been raised by the petitioner, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there is no application of mind on the part of the Detaining Authority in arriving at the subjective



HCP.No.1801/2023

WEB COPY

satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail in the ground case as the order passed in the similar case in CrI.MP.No.18439/2018 by the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Chennai,⁷⁶ which was relied on as a similar case by the Detaining Authority is not similar to the present case. Learned counsel pointed out that the learned Judge, while granting bail to the detenu in the said case, had recorded the fact that the charge sheet has not been filed and that the period for custodial interrogation was over and almost the investigation is completed. Whereas, it is not so in the case of the detenu in the ground case. Hence, it is stated that the detention order is liable to be quashed on the ground of total non application of mind.

(4) This Court, upon examination of the records, is unable to discard the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner. From a perusal of the Booklet Volume II, in particular, page No.98, it is seen that the Detaining Authority has relied upon the bail order in CrI.MP.No.18439/2018 granted to the accused in the similar case, to arrive at the subjective satisfaction that the detenue herein is likely to be released on bail in the ground case. However, it is to be pointed out that the learned Judge



HCP.No.1801/2023

WEB COPY

while granting bail in CrI.MP.NO.18439/2018, has particularly recorded the fact that the City Public Prosecutor admitted that charge sheet has not yet been filed and that the period for taking custodial interrogation is over and major part of investigation might have been completed by that time. The case of the detenu herein is not similar to that of the case in CrI.MP.No.18439/2018. Hence, it cannot be compared with. The Detaining Authority has not taken into consideration this vital aspect, while arriving at the subjective satisfaction. Hence, the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority 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 [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



HCP.No.1801/2023

WEB COPY

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 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



HCP.No.1801/2023

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 ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and in view of the aforesaid facts, this Court is of the view that the detention order is liable to be quashed.

(7) Accordingly, the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 09.08.2023 in No.348/BCDFGISSSV/2023 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenue is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless she is required in connection with any other case.

[SSSRJ] [SMJ]
19.12.2023

AP
Internet : Yes



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1801/2023

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St George, Chennai 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police
Vepery, Chennai.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai.
- 4.The Inspector of Police
V1 Villivakkam Police Station
Chennai District.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1801/2023

S.S.SUNDAR, J.,

AND

SUNDER MOHAN, J.,

AP

H.C.P.No.1801/2023

19.12.2023