



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.369 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 24.07.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.369 of 2024

Tamilarasi

.. Petitioner/
Wife of detenue

Versus

1. The Secretary to the Government
of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort Saint George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
No.132, EVK Sampath Road,
Vepery, Periyamet,
Chennai.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai.
4. The Inspector of Police,
Team 27, Forgery Investigation Wing,
Central Crime Branch II,
No.132, EVK Sampath Road,
Vepery, Periyamet,



H.C.P.No.369 of 2024

Chennai.

.. Respondents

WEB COPY

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 passed by the 2nd respondent dated 02.01.2024 bearing number No.04/BCDFGISSSV/2024 detaining the detainee under Section 3(2) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982, as a Drug Offender, quashing the same and consequently setting the detainee Mr.Maheshwaran @ Mahesh (Male/aged about 43 years), S/o.Karandhamali, now detained at Central Prison, Puzhal at liberty.

For Petitioner : M/s.Tamilarasi,
for Mr.M.Rajeswaran

For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the wife of the detainee viz., Maheshwaran @ Mahesh, son of Karandhamalai, aged about 43 years, who is detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 02.01.2024 slapped on her husband, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber



H.C.P.No.369 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 this petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner focused mainly on the ground that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority that the detinue moved a bail application before the appropriate Court which is pending, suffers from non-application of mind, as the Special Report of the Sponsoring Authority is not dated. Hence, the learned counsel raised a *bona fide* doubt as to when the documents were obtained and as to the date on which the Special Report was sent by the Sponsoring Authority to the Detaining Authority. The learned counsel further pointed out that, unless the Special Report of the Sponsoring Authority is immediately before the Detention Order, it may not have relevance and hence, the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining



H.C.P.No.369 of 2024

Authority based on these undated documents, would vitiate the Detention Order.

4. It is seen from the records that the Special Report of the Sponsoring Authority is not dated. On a perusal of the Grounds of Detention, it is seen that, in Para No.4, the Detaining Authority has stated that the Sponsoring Authority has stated that he came to understand that the detainee moved a bail application before the appropriate Court which is pending and has arrived at the subjective satisfaction that the detainee is likely to be released on bail. When the Special Report of the Sponsoring Authority is not dated, the veracity of the Report becomes doubtful. The compelling necessity to detain the detainee would also depend on when the Sponsoring Authority has sent his Report. In the absence of the report, the compelling necessity to detain, becomes suspect. Hence, this Court is of the view that the subjective satisfaction arrived at by the Detaining Authority based on such undated materials, 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



H.C.P.No.369 of 2024

WEB COPY

'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 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



H.C.P.No.369 of 2024

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 on 02.01.2024 in No.04/BCDFGISSSV/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenue viz., Maheshwaran @ Mahesh, son of Karandhamalai, aged about 43 years, who is detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case.



H.C.P.No.369 of 2024

WEB COPY

[M.S.R., J]
24.07.2024

[S.M., J]

Index : yes/no
Speaking order/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation : yes/no
grs

Note :- Registry shall forthwith return the booklet containing the materials, on which, the Detaining Authority has placed reliance, to the petitioner/counsel for the petitioner with due acknowledgment.

To

1. The Secretary to the Government
of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort Saint George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
No.132, EVK Sampath Road,
Vepery, Periyamet,
Chennai.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai.
4. The Inspector of Police,
Team 27, Forgery Investigation Wing,
Central Crime Branch II,
No.132, EVK Sampath Road,
Vepery, Periyamet,
Chennai.



H.C.P.No.369 of 2024

WEB COPY 5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.369 of 2024

**M.S.RAMESH, J.
AND
SUNDER MOHAN, J.**

grs

H.C.P.No.369 of 2024

24.07.2024