



H.C.P.No.2109 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED: 15.12.2023

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.2109 of 2023

Vijaya  
W/o Baskar

..

Petitioner

v.

1. Government of Tamil Nadu rep.by its  
The Secretary  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department  
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009

2. The Commissioner of Police  
Avadi City

3. The Superintendent of Prison  
Central Prison, Puzhal  
Chennai

4. The Inspector of Police  
M-4, Red Hills Police Station  
Tiruvallur District

..

Respondents

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



H.C.P.No.2109 of 2023

detention order passed in Memo No.193/BCDFGISSSV/2023 dated 26.07.2023 on the file of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the body of petitioner's grand son Thiru.Praveen Kumar @ Kushmi, M/A 22 years, S/o Suresh now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Honble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner :: Mr.D.Padmanabhan

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 grandmother of the detenu, namely, Praveen Kumar @ Kushmi, aged 22 years, S/o Suresh, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent dated 26.07.2023 slapped on her grandson, 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.2109 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 submitted that the detaining authority, without any material, has merely stated that the relatives of the detenu are taking steps to take the detenu on bail when the detenu had not moved any bail application in the ground case. He also pointed out that the special report of the sponsoring authority is not dated. Therefore, the learned counsel submitted that the subjective satisfaction of the detaining authority suffers from non-application of mind and the same vitiates the detention order.

4. This Court, on perusal of the records, finds that the special report of the sponsoring authority did not contain the date. Similarly, the detaining authority, without any material to show that the relatives of the detenu are taking steps to take the detenu on bail, on mere ipse dixit, has passed the detention order against the detenu. In such circumstances, the subjective



satisfaction of the detaining authority suffers from total non-application of mind, as held by 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***, wherein it has been held as follows:-

*“7. A perusal of the above statement in Para-4 of the grounds of detention shows that no details have been given about the alleged similar cases in which bail was allegedly granted by the court concerned. Neither the date of the alleged bail orders has been mentioned therein, nor the bail application number, nor whether the bail orders were passed in respect of the co-accused on the same case, nor whether the bail orders were passed in respect of other co-accused in cases on the same footing as the case of the accused. All that has been stated in the grounds of detention is that “in similar cases bails were granted by the courts”. In our opinion, in the absence of details this statement is mere ipse dixit, and cannot be relied upon. In our opinion, this itself is sufficient to vitiate the detention order.”*

*27. In our opinion, there is a real possibility of*



*release of a person on bail who is already in custody provided he has moved a bail application which is pending. It follows logically that if no bail application is pending, then there is no likelihood of the person in custody being released on bail, and hence the detention order will be illegal. However, there can be an exception to this rule, that is, where a co-accused whose case stands on the same footing had been granted bail. In such cases, the detaining authority can reasonably conclude that there is likelihood of the detenu being released on bail even though no bail application of his is pending, since most courts normally grant bail on this ground. However, details of such alleged similar cases must be given, otherwise the bald statement of the authority cannot be believed."*

In view of the law enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Rekha's case, this Court is convinced that the impugned detention order is liable to be quashed.

5. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent dated 26.07.2023 in No.193/BCDFGISSSV/2023 is hereby set aside and the



H.C.P.No.2109 of 2023

habeas corpus petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Praveen Kumar @  
Kushmi, S/o Suresh, aged 22 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

15.12.2023

ss

To

1. The Secretary to Government  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department  
Fort St.George  
Chennai 600 009
2. The Commissioner of Police  
Avadi City, Avadi, Chennai
3. The Superintendent  
Central Prison, Puzhal  
Chennai
4. The Inspector of Police  
M-4, Red Hills Police Station  
Tiruvallur District
5. The Public Prosecutor  
High Court, Madras



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2109 of 2023

S.S.SUNDAR,J.

AND

SUNDER MOHAN,J.

SS

H.C.P.No.2109 of 2023

15.12.2023