



WEB COPY



HCP.No.200 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 12.02.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.200 of 2024

Rajalakshmi

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tambaram City,
Tambaram City Police Office,
Sholinganallur, Chennai – 600 119.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.

4.The Inspector of Police,
T-13, Chitlapakkam Police Station,
(CCB/Tambaram City), Chennai.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to
issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the



HCP.No.200 of 2024

detention order in Memo BCDFGISSSV No.19/2023 dated 02.05.2023 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamilnadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's husband R.Rajaji Manikandan @ Manikandan, S/o.Ragavan, aged about 47 years, the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Prem Kumar
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 R.Rajaji Manikandan @ Manikandan, aged 47 years, S/o.Ragavan, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 02.05.2023, slapped on her husband, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest



HCP.No.200 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 pointed out that the bail order relied upon by the Detaining Authority is not similar to the case on hand, by referring to the fact that the order relied upon by the Detaining Authority is a dismissal order and not the bail order. Therefore, the learned counsel submitted that the Detaining Authority has not applied its mind while expressing its subjective satisfaction that the detenu is also likely to be released on bail.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, this Court finds that, the similar case relied upon by the Detaining Authority, i.e., CrI.M.P.No.4260 of 2018, dated 21.08.2018, is a dismissal order and no bail was granted. Hence, this Court is of the view that the subjective satisfaction of the



HCP.No.200 of 2024

Detaining Authority that the detenu is also likely to be released on bail, by relying upon the aforesaid similar case, 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



HCP.No.200 of 2024

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.”

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 02.05.2023 in BCDFGISSSV No.19/2023, is



HCP.No.200 of 2024

hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., R.Rajaji Manikandan @ Manikandan, aged 47 years, S/o.Ragavan, 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]

12.02.2024

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Sni



HCP.No.200 of 2024

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tambaram City,
Tambaram City Police Office,
Sholinganallur, Chennai – 600 119.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
T-13, Chitlapakkam Police Station,
(CCB/Tambaram City), Chennai.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.200 of 2024

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

Sni

H.C.P.No.200 of 2024

12.02.2024