



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1815/2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 01.11.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR . JUSTICE S.S.SUNDAR

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.1815/2023

Vasanthi

Versus

..

Petitioner

- 1.State of Tamil Nadu, rep.by
The Additional Chief Secretary to the
Government, Home, Prohibition &
Excise Department, Fort St George
Chennai 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police
The Greater Chennai City, Vepery
Chennai 600 007.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai-600 066.
- 4.The Inspector of Police, Law and Order
S8 Adambakkam Police Station
Chennai.

..

Respondents



HCP.No.1815/2023

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 in Memo No.163/BCDFGISSSV/2023 dated 15.05.2023 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982, and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's son Arunkumar @ Pinky, son of Sugumar aged about 25 years, the detenu now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Vinoth Kumar
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, mother of the detenu Arunkumar @ Pinky, son of Sugumar, aged 25 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 15.05.2023 slapped on her son, branding him 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.



HCP.No.1815/2023

WEB COPY

(3)The learned counsel for the petitioner though canvassed several points before this Court, this Court is able to find some force in his submission that there is no application of mind on the part of the Detaining Authority in arriving at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail in the ground case by referring to an order passed in the similar case in Crl.MP.No.2054/2023 by the learned Sessions Judge, Chennai. Learned counsel pointed out that the learned Judge while granting bail to the accused in the similar case, had observed that the accused therein has got only one previous case. Whereas, the detenu in the present case has six previous cases. This aspect was not considered by the Detaining Authority while arriving at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail in the ground case and hence, the learned counsel submitted that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority suffers from non application of mind. Hence, on the above ground, the Detention Order is liable to be quashed.

(4)From a perusal of the Booklet, in particular, page No.231, it is seen that the Detaining Authority has relied upon the said bail order in Crl.MP.No.2054/2023 granted to the accused therein, to arrive at the



HCP.No.1815/2023

WEB COPY

subjective satisfaction that the detenu herein is likely to be released on bail in the ground case. However, it is to be pointed out that the learned Judge while granting bail in CrI.MP.No.2054/2023 has particularly observed that the accused therein had got only one previous case. Whereas, the detenu herein has got six previous cases. 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 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



HCP.No.1815/2023

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 case. A mere ipse dixit statement in the grounds of detention cannot sustain the detention order and has to be ignored.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1815/2023

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 reason, 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 15.05.2023 in BCDFGISSSV No.163/2023 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.]
01.11.2023

AP
Internet : Yes



HCP.No.1815/2023

WEB COPY To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to the
Government, State of Tamil Nadu
Home, Prohibition &
Excise Department, Fort St George
Chennai 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police
The Greater Chennai City, Vepery
Chennai 600 007.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai-600 066.
- 4.The Inspector of Police, Law and Order
S8 Adambakkam Police Station
Chennai.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1815/2023

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

AP

H.C.P.No.1815/2023

01.11.2023