



HCP.No.6 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 05.04.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.6 of 2024

Muthuselvi

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Assistant Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 09.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai – 66.

4.The Inspector of Police, (L&O),
T-4 Maduravoyal Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondents



HCP.No.6 of 2024

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records in Connection with the order of Detention passed by the second respondent dated 06.12.2023 in Memo.No.645/BCDFGISSSV/2023 against the petitioner's husband namely Suresh, Male aged 34 years, S/o. Thangapandi, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenue before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Senthilvel

For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak,
Additional Public Prosecutor
assisted by Mr.C. Aravind

ORDER

M.S.RAMESH, J.
AND
SUNDER MOHAN, J.

The petitioner herein, who is the wife of the detenu Suresh, aged 34 years, S/o.Thangapandi, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 06.12.2023 slapped on her husband, branding him as "GOONDA" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders,



HCP.No.6 of 2024

Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Sexual Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

3. Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the bail order in the similar case relied on by the Detaining Authority to arrive at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail, was obtained since the substantial part of investigation was complete in that case.

4. On a perusal of the Grounds of Detention, it is seen that the Detaining Authority had relied upon the order of bail passed in a similar case in CrI.O.P.No.5203/2023 by the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge at Tiruvallur, to arrive at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be



HCP.No.6 of 2024

released on bail. However, bail was granted to the accused in the similar case in CrI.O.P.No.5203/2023 dated 03.11.2023, as substantial part of investigation was complete in that case. It is in the said circumstances, this Court finds that the subjective satisfaction arrived at by the Detaining Authority suffers from non-application of mind. Hence, on the above ground, the Detention Order is liable to be quashed.

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**', had dealt with a situation where the Detention Order is passed without an application of mind. 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. 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 paragraph Nos.10 and 11 of the said judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court:-



HCP.No.6 of 2024

“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.6 of 2024

WEB COPY

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. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 06.12.2023 in No.645/BCDFGISSSV/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., JSuresh, aged 34 years, S/o.Thangapandi, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R., J]

[S.M., J]

05.04.2024

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Tsg



HCP.No.6 of 2024

WEB COPY

To

1.The Assistant Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 09.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai – 66.

4.The Inspector of Police, (L&O),
T-4 Maduravoyal Police Station,
Chennai.

5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.6 of 2024

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
SUNDER MOHAN, J.

Tsg

H.C.P.No.6 of 2024

05.04.2024