



WEB COPY



*HCP.No.2066 of 2023*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 22.12.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR . JUSTICE **S.S.SUNDAR**  
AND  
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **SUNDER MOHAN**

**H.C.P.No.2066 of 2023**

Rajeshwari .. Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Secretariat, Fort St. George, Chennai - 9.

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

3.The Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison – Coimbatore,  
Coimbatore District.

4.State rep. By its  
The Inspector of Police,  
South Police Station,  
Tiruppur City, Tiruppur District.

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of The Constitution of India  
praying for a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the entire records  
relating to the petitioner's husband detention under Tamil Nadu Act  
14 of 1982 vide detention order dated 22.08.2023 on the file of the  
second respondent made in proceedings Memo



*HCP.No.2066 of 2023*

C.No.45/D.O./IS/Tiruppur City/2023 quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's husband namely Alagarsamy, S/o.Alagarsamy, aged 53 years before this Court and set the petitioner's husband at liberty from detention, now the petitioner's husband detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore.

For Petitioner : Mr.W.Camyles Gandhi

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.**]

The petitioner, wife of the detenu Alagarsamy, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 22.08.2023 slapped on her husband, branding him as "Drug Offender" 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].



*HCP.No.2066 of 2023*

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

3. Though several grounds have been raised in the petition, 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 satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail in the ground case as the order dated 29.06.2020 passed in the similar case in Spl.C.M.P.No.115 of 2020 by the learned Additional District Judge, Special Court for EC Act Cases, Coimbatore, is not similar to the present case. Learned counsel pointed out that in the said case, only interim bail was granted. Hence, the said case cannot be compared to the case of the detenu.

4. This Court, upon examination of the records, is unable to discard the said contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner. From a perusal of the Booklet, in particular, page No.89, it is seen that the Detaining Authority has relied upon the bail order in Spl.C.M.P.No.115 of 2020 granted to the accused therein, to arrive at the 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 has granted only interim bail in



*HCP.No.2066 of 2023*

that case. 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 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:-



*HCP.No.2066 of 2023*

**"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."*



*HCP.No.2066 of 2023*

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. In view of the aforesaid reason, the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 22.08.2023 in C.No.45/D.O./IS/Tiruppur City/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Alagarsamy, S/o.Alagarsamy, aged about 53 years, 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.]**  
22.12.2023

Index:Yes/No  
Neutral Citation:Yes/No  
mmi

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Secretariat, Fort St. George, Chennai - 9.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,  
Detaining Authority,  
Tiruppur City, Tiruppur District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison – Coimbatore,  
Coimbatore District.



*HCP.No.2066 of 2023*

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

5.The Public Prosecutor  
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



*HCP.No.2066 of 2023*

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

mmi

**H.C.P.No.2066 of 2023**

**22.12.2023**