



HCP.No.188 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 04.04.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.188 of 2024

Chinnan

... Petitioner/father of the detenu

Vs.

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

2.The Commissioner of Police/Detaining Authority,
Tiruppur City,
Tiruppur District.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison-Coimbatore,
Coimbatore District.

4.State rep. by its
The Inspector of Police,
South Police Station,
Tiruppur City,
Tiruppur District.

... Respondents



HCP.No.188 of 2024

WEB COPY

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the entire records, relating to the petitioner's son detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order, dated 01.12.2023 on the file of the second respondent herein made in proceedings Memo C.No.73/G/IS/Tiruppur City/2023, quash the same as illegal and consequently, direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's son namely Ganesan, S/o.Chinnan, aged 43 years before this Court and set the petitioner's son at liberty from detention, now the petitioner's son detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore.

For Petitioner	: Mr.W.Camyles Gandhi
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 father of the detenu viz., Ganesan, S/o.Chinnan, aged 43 years, detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 01.12.2023,



HCP.No.188 of 2024

slapped on his 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.

3. Though several grounds are raised in this petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner focused mainly on the ground that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority that the family members of the detenu are taking steps to take out the detenu on bail, suffers from non-application of mind as the Special Report filed by the Investigating Officer is not dated. Hence, the learned counsel raised a *bona fide* doubt as to when 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



HCP.No.188 of 2024

Authority is immediately before the Detention Order, it may not have relevance and hence, the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority based on this undated document, would vitiate the Detention Order.

4. It is seen from the records that the Special Report of the Sponsoring Authority is not dated. Further, the statement obtained by the Sponsoring Authority from the family members of the detenu, enclosed in the Booklet, stating that they are planning to file a bail application to bring out the detenu on bail, is also not dated. On a perusal of the Grounds of Detention, it is seen that, in Para No.5, the Detaining Authority has stated that the family members of the detenu are taking steps to take him out on bail by filing bail applications before the appropriate Court and has arrived at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail. When the statements obtained by the Sponsoring Authority from the family members of the detenu stating that they are planning to file bail application to bring out the detenu on bail, is not dated and even the Special Report of the Sponsoring



HCP.No.188 of 2024

Authority is not dated, the veracity of the Report becomes doubtful. The compelling necessity to detain the detenu 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 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.188 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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.188 of 2024

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 01.12.2023 in C.No.73/G/IS/Tiruppur City/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Ganesan, S/o.Chinnan, aged 43 years, detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore, 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]

04.04.2024

Index: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Anu



WEB COPY



HCP.No.188 of 2024

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

Anu

To

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

2.The Commissioner of Police/Detaining Authority,
Tiruppur City,
Tiruppur District.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison-Coimbatore,
Coimbatore District.

4.The Inspector of Police,
South Police Station,
Tiruppur City,
Tiruppur District.

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

6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.188 of 2024

04.04.2024