



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.351 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 06.06.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.351 of 2024

Madhanagopal

... Petitioner / uncle of the detainee

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Chennai.

3.The Inspector of Police,
J-7 Velachery Police Station,
Chennai.

4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai.

... Respondents

Prayer : Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the entire records relating to petitioner's brother in law



H.C.P.No.351 of 2024

detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order, dated 04.01.2024 on the file of the second respondent herein made in proceedings BCDFGISSSV No.12/2024 and quash the same as illegal and consequently, direct the respondents herein to produce the said petitioner's brother in law namely Balamurugan, aged 33 years, son of Jayakrishnan, before this Court and set him at liberty, now petitioner's brother in law detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai-600 066.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.C.Chellappan

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner, who is the uncle of the detenu viz., Balamurugan, aged 33 years, son of Jayakrishnan, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 04.01.2024 slapped on his brother-in-law, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu



Act 14 of 1982].

WEB COPY

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and 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 detenue has got two previous cases, whereas, in the similar case bail order relied upon, the accused therein had no previous cases.

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.5203 of 2023, is not similar to the case on hand, that the accused therein had no previous cases. However, there are two previous cases against the detenue 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.

WEB COPY

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 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 second respondent in BCDFGISSSV No.12/2024, dated 04.01.2024, is hereby



H.C.P.No.351 of 2024

set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz.,

Balamurugan, aged 33 years, son of Jayakrishnan, 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]

06.06.2024

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Anu

To

1.Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Chennai.

3.The Inspector of Police,
J-7 Velachery Police Station,
Chennai.

4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai.

5.The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.



H.C.P.No.351 of 2024

6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

WEB COPY



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.351 of 2024

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

Anu

H.C.P.No.351 of 2024

06.06.2024