



WEB COPY



HCP.No.577 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 18.06.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.577 of 2024

Aarthi

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamilnadu
Represented by Secretary to Government
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)
Veppery
Chennai-07

3.The Superintendent of Police
Central Prison, Puzhal

4.The Inspector of Police
M-3, Puzhal Police Station
Chennai 600 066

... Respondents



HCP.No.577 of 2024

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 dated 24.01.2024 passed by the second respondent in BCDFGISSSV No.55 of 2024 and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's husband Nagaraj @ Youtube Nagaraj S/o.Kumar, aged 23 years, who is presently under going detention in the Central Prison, Puzhal before this court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Chandrasekar

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 detenu viz.Nagaraj @ Youtube Nagaraj, S/o.Kumar, aged about 23 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 24.01.2024 slapped on her husband, branding him as "GOONDA" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law



HCP.No.577 of 2024

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 submitted that the bail order in the similar case relied on by the Detaining Authority to arrive at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail, was obtained where the learned Public Prosecutor had no serious objection for grant of bail to the accused therein.

4. On a perusal of the Grounds of Detention, it is seen that the Detaining Authority had relied upon the order of bail passed in a similar case in Crl.M.P.No.8231 of 2018 by the learned Additional Sessions Judge / Vacation Session Judge, Chennai, to arrive at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is



HCP.No.577 of 2024

likely to be released on bail. However, bail was granted to the accused in the similar case in CrI.M.P.No.8231/2018 dated 30.05.2018, as there was no objection on the side of the prosecution to release the accused therein on bail. It is in the said circumstances, this Court finds that the subjective satisfaction arrived at by the Detaining Authority suffers from non-application of mind. Hence, on the above ground, the Detention Order is liable to be quashed.

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



HCP.No.577 of 2024

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.”*



HCP.No.577 of 2024

WEB COPY

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. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 24.01.2024 in No.55 / BCDFGISSSV /2024 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Nagaraj @ Youtube Nagaraj, aged about 23 years, S/o.Kumar, 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]
18.06.2024

Index: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

kas

To

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

Page 6 of 8



HCP.No.577 of 2024

2.The Commissioner of P.Olice
Greater Chennai
Office of the Commissioner of Police
(Goondas Section)
Veppery
Chennai-07

3.The Superintendent of Police
Central Prison, Puzhal

4.The Inspector of Police
M-3, Puzhal Police Station
Chennai 600 066

5.The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras
Chennai 600 104



WEB COPY



HCP.No.577 of 2024

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

kas

H.C.P.No.577 of 2024

18.06.2024