



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.212 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 24.07.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.212 of 2024

G.Mounika

.. Petitioner

Versus

1. Government of Tamil Nadu
represented by its
Secretary to Government,
Department of Home, Prohibition and Excise,
Chepauk, Chennai - 5.
 2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Vepery,
Chennai.
 3. The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch - II,
Forgery Investigation Wing,
Chennai.
 4. The Superintendent of Prisons,
Office of the Superintendent of Prisons,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai - 600 066.
- .. Respondents**



H.C.P.No.212 of 2024

Prayer : Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records relating to the detention order made in Order No.696/BCDFGISSSV/2023, dated 26.12.2023 passed by the second respondent herein and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the body of the detainee, Divakar Reddy, aged 32/2024, S/o.K.Raja Reddy, residing at 1-14, Otiri Palli, Otiripalle, Vepanapalle, Chittoor, Andhra Pradesh - 517 422, and now detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Venkatesan

For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is wife of the detainee viz., Divakar Reddy, S/o.Raja Reddy, aged about 32 years, who is detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 26.12.2023 slapped on her husband, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders,



H.C.P.No.212 of 2024

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 this petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner focused mainly on the ground that the detainee moved a bail application before the appropriate Court which is pending, suffers from non-application of mind, as the Special Report of the Sponsoring Authority is not dated. Hence, the learned counsel raised a *bona fide* doubt as to when the documents were obtained and as to the date on which the Special Report was sent by the Sponsoring Authority to the Detaining Authority. The learned counsel further pointed out that, unless the Special Report of the Sponsoring Authority is immediately before the Detention Order, it may not have relevance and hence, the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority based on these undated documents, would vitiate the Detention Order.



H.C.P.No.212 of 2024

WEB COPY

4. It is seen from the records that the Special Report of the Sponsoring Authority is not dated. On a perusal of the Grounds of Detention, it is seen that, in Para No.3, the Detaining Authority has stated that the Sponsoring Authority has stated that he came to understand that the detainee moved a bail application before the appropriate Court which is pending and has arrived at the subjective satisfaction that the detainee is likely to be released on bail. When the Special Report of the Sponsoring Authority is not dated, the veracity of the Report becomes doubtful. The compelling necessity to detain the detainee would also depend on when the Sponsoring Authority has sent his Report. In the absence of the report, the compelling necessity to detain, becomes suspect. Hence, this Court is of the view that the subjective satisfaction arrived at by the Detaining Authority based on such undated materials, 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 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



H.C.P.No.212 of 2024

WEB COPY

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:-

“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.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.212 of 2024

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.”

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 on 26.12.2023 in No.696/BCDFGISSSV/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenue viz., Divakar Reddy, son of Raja Reddy, aged about 32 years, who is detained at 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]
24.07.2024

Index : yes/no
Speaking order/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation : yes/no



H.C.P.No.212 of 2024

Note :- Registry shall forthwith return the booklet containing the materials, on which, the Detaining Authority has placed reliance, to the petitioner/counsel for the petitioner with due acknowledgment.



H.C.P.No.212 of 2024

To

WEB COPY

1. The Secretary to Government,
Department of Home, Prohibition and Excise,
Chepauk, Chennai - 5.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Vepery,
Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch - II,
Forgery Investigation Wing,
Chennai.
4. The Superintendent of Prisons,
Office of the Superintendent of Prisons,
Central Prion, Puzhal,
Chennai - 600 066.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.212 of 2024

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

grs

H.C.P.No.212 of 2024

24.07.2024