



WEB COPY



HCP.No.294 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 22.03.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.294 of 2024

Maheswari

... Petitioner/detenue's wife

Vs.

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Office of the Commissioner of Police (Goondas Section),
Vepery,
Chennai-600 077.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Puzhal,
Chennai District.

4.The Inspector of Police Law and Order,
S-7, Madipakkam Police Station,
Chennai District.

... Respondents



HCP.No.294 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 relating to the detention order vide BCDFGISSSV.No.593/2023 dated 17.11.2023, passed by the second respondent and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's husband namely Santhoshkumar @ Simili, S/o.Manivannan, aged 30 years, (who is presently under going detention in the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai), before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.N.Arun 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 namely Santhoshkumar @ Simili, S/o.Manivannan, aged 30 years, detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 17.11.2023 slapped on her husband, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic



HCP.No.294 of 2024

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 only one previous case as against the accused therein, whereas, the detainee herein has got four previous cases.

4. The detaining authority has placed reliance on a similar case in CrI.M.P.No.2054 of 2023, where bail was granted to the accused therein and accordingly inferred that there was an imminent possibility of the detainee coming out on bail. In the similar case relied upon by the detaining



HCP.No.294 of 2024

authority, the petitioner therein had one previous case pending against him.

Though the detaining authority has referred to only one adverse case in the order of detention, the remand report shows that the detenu has got four pending cases. As such, 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'***, 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 paragraphs 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.294 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.294 of 2024

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 in BCDFGISSSV No.593/2023 dated 17.11.2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Santhoshkumar @ Simili, S/o.Manivannan, aged 30 years, detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, 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]

22.03.2024

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Anu



HCP.No.294 of 2024

WEB COPY

To

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Office of the Commissioner of Police (Goondas Section),
Vepery,
Chennai-600 077.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Puzhal,
Chennai District.

4.The Inspector of Police Law and Order,
S-7, Madipakkam Police Station,
Chennai District.

5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.294 of 2024

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

Anu

H.C.P.No.294 of 2024

22.03.2024