



WEB COPY



HCP.No.286 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 30.04.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.286 of 2024

Ramya

... Petitioner

Vs.

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Vepery, Chennai – 600 007.

3.The Inspector of Police,
Prohibition Enforcement Wing,
Anna Nagar West Zone,
Arumbakkam, Chennai – 600 106.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Special Cell for Women,
Puzhal, 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 relating to the



HCP.No.286 of 2024

detention order dated 07.11.2023 passed by the 2nd respondent herein in his proceedings Memo No.552/BCDFGISSSV/2023 under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and to quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's mother namely Dhanalakshmi, W/o.Ramesh, aged about 53 years, now under detention as Goondas at Special Cell for Women, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set her at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Angamuthu

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 daughter of the detainee namely Dhanalakshmi, aged about 53 years, W/o.Ramesh, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 07.11.2023 slapped on her mother, branding her as "Drug Offender" 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].



HCP.No.286 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 Detaining Authority has not applied its mind while expressing its subjective satisfaction that the detainee is also likely to be released on bail. It is his submission that the case relied upon by the Detaining Authority is not similar to the present case, as the bail was granted in favour of the accused therein by recording the fact that there was no previous case as against the accused therein.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, this Court finds that the bail order relied upon by the Detaining Authority in CrI.M.P.No.1414 of 2021, is not similar to the case on hand since the accused therein was granted bail after recording the fact that no previous case was reported against the accused therein. However, it is admitted that there are 2 adverse cases as against the detainee herein. Considering the nature of the bail order in the similar case relied upon by the Detaining Authority and the case on hand, this



HCP.No.286 of 2024

Court finds that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority that the detinue is also 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***', 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 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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.286 of 2024

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.



HCP.No.286 of 2024

WEB COPY

7. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 07.11.2023 in No.552/BCDFGISSSV/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenue namely Dhanalakshmi, aged about 53 years, W/o.Ramesh, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless her confinement is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R., J]

[S.M., J]

30.04.2024

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Sni



HCP.No.286 of 2024

WEB COPY

To

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Vepery, Chennai – 600 007.

3.The Inspector of Police,
Prohibition Enforcement Wing,
Anna Nagar West Zone,
Arumbakkam, Chennai – 600 106.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Special Cell for Women,
Puzhal, Chennai.

5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.286 of 2024

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

Sni

H.C.P.No.286 of 2024

30.04.2024