



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1863 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 20.12.2023

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.1863 of 2023

Lakshmi
W/o Sekar

..

Petitioner

v.

1. The Secretary to the Government
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009
2. The Commissioner of Police / Detaining Authority
Tambaram City, Tambaram
3. The Superintendent
Central Prison, Puzhal
Chennai
4. State rep by: The Inspector of Police
T-10, Manimangalam Police Station
Tambaram District .. Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India,
praying for issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records in



H.C.P.No.1863 of 2023

connection with the order of detention passed by the 2nd respondent dated 10.08.2023 in BCDFGISSSV No.36/2023 against the petitioner's son Dinesh, M/25 years, son of Sekar, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai and set aside the same and consequently direct the respondents to produce the detenu before the Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner :: Mr.A.Saranraj

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, S.Dinesh, aged 25 years, S/o Sekar, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 10.08.2023 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 (Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982).



H.C.P.No.1863 of 2023

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.5200 of 2021 dated 20.11.2021 by the Principal Sessions Court, Kancheepuram at Chengalpattu in respect of the accused in similar case, which is not similar to the case on hand, as the bail was granted to the accused therein by recording the fact that there was no bad antecedent against him. Whereas in the present case, it is admitted that there is one adverse case against the detenu. 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.

4. This Court perused page-171 of the booklet and is convinced with the statement of the learned counsel for petitioner that the bail was granted to the accused in similar case on the ground that there was no bad



antecedent reported against him. Admittedly, the detenu in the present case is involved in one adverse case. This Court has held in several cases that the detention order is vitiated if there is no application of mind as to the real ground on which the bail was granted to the accused in similar case. It is also relevant to point out that 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. It is relevant to extract paragraph Nos.10 and 11 of the said judgment of the 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 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 detention order is liable to be quashed.

5. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 10.08.2023 in BCDFGISSSV No.36/2023 is hereby set aside and the habeas corpus petition is allowed. The detenu viz., S.Dinesh, S/o Sekar, aged 25



H.C.P.No.1863 of 2023

years, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case.

Index : yes/no

(S.S.S.R.,J.)

(S.M.,J.)

Neutral citation : yes/no

20.12.2023

SS

To

1. The Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department
Secretariat
Chennai 600 009
2. The Commissioner of Police / Detaining Authority
Tambaram City, Tambaram
3. The Superintendent
Central Prison, Puzhal
Chennai
4. The Inspector of Police
T-10, Manimangalam Police Station
Tambaram District
5. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1863 of 2023

S.S.SUNDAR,J.

AND

SUNDER MOHAN,J.

SS

H.C.P.No.1863 of 2023

20.12.2023