



WEB COPY



HCP.No.352 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 16.04.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.352 of 2024

Periya Muniyamma

... Petitioner

Vs.

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

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

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Cuddalore, Cuddalore District.

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

5.The Inspector of Police,
Pew-Cuddalore,
Cuddalore District.

... Respondents



HCP.No.352 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 detention order in C3/D.O./84/2023, dated 13.12.2023 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 son MAJA @ MAHARAJA S/O. CHINNAPPA aged about 27 years the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Cuddalore before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.U.Yuvaraj

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 mother of the detenu namely Thiru.Maja @ Maharaja, aged about 27 years, S/o. Chinnappa, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 13.12.2023 slapped on her son, branding him as "Drug Offender" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities



HCP.No.352 of 2024

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 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 detenu 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.4762 of 2022, dated 22.09.2022, 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



HCP.No.352 of 2024

against the accused therein. However, it is admitted that there is one adverse case as against the detenu herein. Considering the nature of the bail order in the similar case relied upon by the Detaining Authority and the case on hand, this Court finds that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority that the detenu 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'***, 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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.352 of 2024

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.”



HCP.No.352 of 2024

6.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor placed reliance on a recent decision of the Hon'ble Full Bench of this Court in ***N.Fathima @ Laila Vs. The State of Tamil Nadu*** in HCP(MD)No.1121 of 2022 and batch., and submitted that in a similar case not being similar in nature will not be fatal to the Detention Order.

7.We had already discussed this aspect in the case of ***Jayalskshmi vs. The State of Tamil Nadu*** in HCP.No.330 of 2024 and held that the Dictum laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Rekha's*** case (supra) and the other cases referred therein would be binding on us and have also rendered our reasons therein. Hence, the submission of the learned Additional Public Prosecutor in this regard does not require consideration.

8.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.

9. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 13.12.2023 in C3/D.O./84/2023, is hereby set aside



HCP.No.352 of 2024

and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Thiru.Maja @
Maharaja, aged about 27 years, S/o. Chinnappa, 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]

16.04.2024

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Internet: Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Tsg



HCP.No.352 of 2024

WEB COPY

To

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

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

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Cuddalore, Cuddalore District.

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

5.The Inspector of Police,
Pew-Cuddalore,
Cuddalore District.

6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.352 of 2024

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

Tsg

H.C.P.No.352 of 2024

16.04.2024