



WEB COPY



HCP.No.534 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 28.03.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.534 of 2024

Annakili

... Petitioner

Vs.

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

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Ariyalur District, Ariyalur.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Ariyalur District.

4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli.

5.The Inspector of Police,
Udayarpalayam Police Station,
Ariyalur District.

... Respondents

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 passed by the second respondent pertaining to the order



HCP.No.534 of 2024

made in Cr.M.P.No.26/2023 dated 30.11.2023 in detaining the detenu under 2(f) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982, as a GOONDA and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the detenu Velmurugan, S/o.Manivel, aged about 33 years, who is detained at Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.M.Karunakaran

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 Velmurugan, aged about 33 years, S/o.Manivel, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 30.11.2023 slapped on her son, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities 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].



HCP.No.534 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 relatives of the detenu are taking efforts to move bail application to take him out on bail, suffers from non-application of mind, as there is no statement under 161 Cr.P.C., of the relatives of the detenu. Hence, the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority without any documents, would vitiate the Detention Order.

4. On a perusal of the Grounds of Detention and the booklet, it is seen that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority that the relatives of the detenu are taking efforts to move bail application to take him out on bail is not supported with any statement under 161 Cr.P.C., of the relatives. When there is no statement obtained by the Sponsoring Authority from the relatives of the detenu stating that they are planning to file bail application to bring out the detenu on bail, the veracity of such



HCP.No.534 of 2024

statement becomes doubtful. In the absence of the 161 Cr.P.C. statement, the compelling necessity to detain, becomes suspect. Hence, this Court is of the view that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority without any material, 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 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,



WEB COPY



HCP.No.534 of 2024

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.



HCP.No.534 of 2024

WEB COPY

7. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 30.11.2023 in Cr.M.P.No.26/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Velmurugan, aged about 33 years, S/o.Manivel, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R., J]

[S.M., J]

28.03.2024

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Sni



HCP.No.534 of 2024

WEB COPY

To

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

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Ariyalur District, Ariyalur.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Ariyalur District.

4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.

5.The Inspector of Police,
Udayarpalayam Police Station,
Ariyalur District.

6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.534 of 2024

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

Sni

H.C.P.No.534 of 2024

28.03.2024