



WEB COPY



HCP.No.174 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 22.03.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.174 of 2024

S.Muniammal

... Petitioner/detenuue's mother

Vs.

1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police/Detaining Authority,
Greater Chennai,
Vepery, Chennai.

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

4.The Inspector of Police,
K-6 T.P.Chatram Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records pertaining to the order of detention passed by the second respondent in his proceedings in No.583/BCDFGISSSV/2023, dated 15.11.2023 and quash the same as



HCP.No.174 of 2024

illegal and produce the detenue, namely Barath @ Barathraj, S/o.Selvam, aged 23 years, as Goonda, now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal II before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Raja
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 mother of the detenu namely Barath @ Barathraj, S/o.Selvam, aged 23 years, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal II, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 15.11.2023 slapped on her son, 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].

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



HCP.No.174 of 2024

3. Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there is total non-application of mind by the Detaining Authority in the present case, as the observation of the Detaining Authority that the detenu is likely to come out on bail and indulge in further activities, is not supported by any materials.

4. In the grounds of detention, the detaining authority has stated that the detenu is likely to come out on bail and that he would indulge in further activities. However, the said observation made in the grounds of detention is mere *ipsi dixit* without any material. Therefore, the subjective satisfaction of the detaining authority that the detenu is likely to be released on bail 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**', 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:-

“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



HCP.No.174 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. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 15.11.2023 in No.583/BCDFGISSSV/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Barath @ Barathraj, S/o.Selvam, aged 23 years, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal II, 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]

22.03.2024

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes/No



HCP.No.174 of 2024

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

WEB COPY
Anu



WEB COPY



HCP.No.174 of 2024

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

Anu

To

1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police/Detaining Authority,
Greater Chennai,
Vepery, Chennai.

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

4.The Inspector of Police,
K-6 T.P.Chatram Police Station,
Chennai.

5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.174 of 2024

22.03.2024