



H.C.P.No.123 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 29.04.2024

CORAM :

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH**

**AND**

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN**

**H.C.P.No.123 of 2024**

Sulochana

... Petitioner/mother of the detenue

***Vs.***

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,  
Rep. by the Additional Chief Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Secretariat, Chennai-600009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,  
Greater Chennai,  
Office of the Commissioner of Police,  
(Goondas Section), Vepery,  
Chennai-600 007

3.The Superintendent of Police,  
Central Prison, Puzhal,  
Chennai.

4.The Inspector of Police,  
P-6, Kodungaiyur Police Station,  
Chennai.

... Respondents



H.C.P.No.123 of 2024

**Prayer:** Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records relating to the detention order in BCDFGISSSV No.699/2023 dated 29.12.2023 passed by the second respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondent to produce the petitioner's son, Muthukumar @ Kullamuthu, S/o.Kuppan, the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and petitioner's son Mr.Muthukumar @ Kullamuthu, S/p.Kuppan, aged about 32 years, the detenu herein and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Ambedkar

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, who is the mother of the detenu viz., Muthukumar @ Kullamuthu, S/o.Kuppan, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 29.12.2023 slapped on her son, branding him as "Drug Offender" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention



H.C.P.No.123 of 2024

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

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 by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the detention order is liable to be quashed on the sole ground that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority regarding the possibility of the detenu coming out on bail by relying upon the bail order granted to the accused in a similar case, suffers from non-application of mind.

4. On a perusal, it is seen that in paragraph 4 of the Grounds of Detention, the Detaining Authority has stated that there is a possibility of the detenu coming out on bail in the ground case since in a similar case i.e. in CrI.M.P.No.7349/2023 connected with Cr.No.123 of 2023, bail was granted to the accused therein. However, a bail order in CrI.M.P.No.5272 of 2023 in connection with Cr.No.123 of 2023 was



H.C.P.No.123 of 2024

furnished to the detenu. On a perusal of the said order, in page No.67 of the Booklet Volume II, this Court finds that the said order relates to release of the accused on bail u/s.167[2] of Cr.P.C. and the bail was granted to the accused therein since he had been in prison for 63 days and not on merits. Therefore, it is not a similar case and the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority, regarding the possibility of the detenu coming out on bail suffers from non-application of mind, which vitiates the detention order. Hence, on this 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'***, has 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:-



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.123 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.”*



H.C.P.No.123 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. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent, in No.699/BCDFGISSSV/2023, dated 29.12.2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Muthukumar @ Kullamuthu, S/o.Kuppan, confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, 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]  
29.04.2024

Index: Yes/No  
Speaking/Non-speaking order

**Anu**

To

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Secretariat, Chennai-600009.



H.C.P.No.123 of 2024

2.The Commissioner of Police,  
Greater Chennai,  
Office of the Commissioner of Police,  
(Goondas Section), Vepery,  
Chennai-600 007

3.The Superintendent of Police,  
Central Prison, Puzhal,  
Chennai.

4.The Inspector of Police,  
P-6, Kodungaiyur Police Station,  
Chennai.

5.The Joint Secretary,  
Law and Order Department,  
Secretariat, Chennai.

6.The Public Prosecutor,  
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.123 of 2024

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

*Anu*

H.C.P.No.123 of 2024

29.04.2024