



WEB COPY



HCP.No.196 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.03.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.196 of 2024

Ilaiyavani

... Petitioner/wife of the detenu

Vs.

1.The State of Tamilnadu,
Represented by Secretary to Government,
Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of District Collector and District Magistrate,
Cuddalore District.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Cuddalore District.

4.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison, Cuddalore.

5.The Inspector of Police,
Vadalur Police Station,
Cuddalore District.

... Respondents



HCP.No.196 of 2024

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records of the second respondent order vide its order No.C3/D.O/73/2023 dated 14.11.2023 and quash the same and direct the second respondent to produce the detenue Sathyaseelan, son of Ravi, aged about 31 years, now confined at Central Prison, Cuddalore, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Ms.B.Shanmuga Priya

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 viz., Sathyaseelan, son of Ravi, aged about 31 years, now confined at Central Prison, Cuddalore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 14.11.2023 slapped on her husband, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders,



HCP.No.196 of 2024

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 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 bail was granted to the accused therein mainly on the ground that the co-accused was granted bail. 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, in the similar case relied upon by the Detaining Authority, i.e., CrI.M.P.No.5147 of 2023, the accused therein was granted bail mainly on the ground that the co-



HCP.No.196 of 2024

accused had been granted bail. This apart, the detenue has got one adverse case. Hence, this Court is of the view that the subjective satisfaction of the 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'***, 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:-

“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



HCP.No.196 of 2024

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.”



HCP.No.196 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 on 14.11.2023 in No.C3/DO/73/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Sathyaseelan, son of Ravi, aged about 31 years, now confined at Central Prison, Cuddalore, 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]

27.03.2024

(2/2)

Index: Yes/No

Anu

To

1.The Secretary to Government,
Prohibition & Excise Department,



HCP.No.196 of 2024

Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009.

WEB COPY

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of District Collector and District Magistrate,
Cuddalore District.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Cuddalore District.

4.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison, Cuddalore.

5.The Inspector of Police,
Vadalur Police Station,
Cuddalore District.

6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.196 of 2024

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

Anu

H.C.P.No.196 of 2024

27.03.2024