



H.C.P.No.370 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 01.03.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.370 of 2024

Devamma

...Petitioner/mother of the Detenu

Vs.

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, St. George Fort, Chennai 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Chennai.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai 600 066
4. The Inspector of Police,
P-5, MKB Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

...Respondents

Prayer : Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the detention order No.409/BCDFGISSSV/2023, dated



H.C.P.No.370 of 2024

20.09.2023, passed by the 2nd respondent under the respondent to produce the petitioner's son Manjunathan, S/o. Marappa, aged about 23 years, the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr. C.M. Ramakrishnan

For Respondents : Mr.A. Gokulakrishnan
Additional Public Prosecutor
assisted by Mr.C.Aravind

ORDER

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

The petitioner, mother of the detenu Manjunathan, aged about 23 years, S/o. Marappa, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 20.09.2023 slapped on her son, branding him as "Goonda" as contemplated under Section 2(f) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.



WEB COPY

3. Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the similar case relied on by the Detaining Authority to arrive at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail in the ground case, is not similar as the similar case relied on by the Detaining Authority in paragraph No.4 is entirely different from the order furnished in page No.88 of the Booklet. Hence, the similar case cited to arrive at the subjective satisfaction, is not similar and placing reliance on such order shows the non-application of mind on the part of the Detaining Authority.

4. On a perusal of the Grounds of Detention, in particular, paragraph No.4, it is seen that the Detaining Authority had relied upon the order of bail in similar case in Cr.M.P.No.19530/2023 passed by the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Chennai. However, a perusal of the Booklet in page No.88, would reveal that the order passed by the very same learned Judge in Crl.MP.No.19403/2023, has been enclosed, which is not referred to



H.C.P.No.370 of 2024

in the grounds of detention. It is not known as to why such extraneous material was supplied in the Booklet. This is bound to confuse the detenu and deny the right to make effective representation. It is in the said circumstances, this Court finds that the subjective satisfaction arrived at by the Detaining Authority to hold that the detenu is likely to be released on bail in the ground 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 considered a case where it is stated that in the grounds of detention that relatives of detenu are taking action to take him on bail in the criminal case in which the detenu was in remand and that in similar case, bail was granted by Courts. Since no details had been given about the alleged similar cases in which bail was allegedly granted by the Court concerned, it is held by Hon'ble Supreme Court that in the absence of details, the statement which is mere *ipse dixit*, cannot be relied upon and that itself is sufficient to 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 paragraphs No.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.

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 2nd respondent dated 20.09.2023 in No.409/BCDFGISSSV/2023 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Manjunathan, aged about 23 years, S/o. Marappa, 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]
01.03.2024

bga

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No



H.C.P.No.370 of 2024

WEB COPY To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, St. George Fort, Chennai 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Chennai.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai 600 066
4. The Inspector of Police,
P-5, MKB Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
6. The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.370 of 2024

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

bga

H.C.P.No.370 of 2024

01.03.2024