



H.C.P.No.563 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 26.04.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.563 of 2024

Tamilselvi

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Addl. Chief Secretary to the Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai
O/o.Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai – 600 007.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Prohibition Enforcement Wing,
Triplicane,
Chennai Dist.

... Respondents



H.C.P.No.563 of 2024

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records in connection with the order of Detention passed by the second respondent dated 27.12.2023 in No.697/BCDFGISSSV/2023 against the petitioner's son namely David, male, aged 24 years, S/o.Prince, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai and to set aside the same and consequently direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Anand

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 the detenu David, aged 24 years, S/o.Prince, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 27.12.2023 slapped on her son, branding him as "Drug Offender" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders,



H.C.P.No.563 of 2024

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 relatives of the detenu are taking steps to take out the detenu on bail, 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.563 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. Further, the statement obtained by the Sponsoring Authority from the relatives of the detenu, enclosed in the Booklet, stating that they are planning to file bail application to bring out the detenu on bail, is also 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 relatives of the detenu are taking steps to take him out on bail by filing bail applications before the appropriate Court and has arrived at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail. When the 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, and the Special Report of the Sponsoring Authority are not dated, the veracity of the Report becomes doubtful. The compelling necessity to detain the detenu would also depend on when the Sponsoring



H.C.P.No.563 of 2024

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 '*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



H.C.P.No.563 of 2024

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



H.C.P.No.563 of 2024

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 27.12.2023 in BCDFGISSSV No.697/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Thiru. David, aged 24 years, S/o.Prince, 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]

26.04.2024

Index: Yes/No
Neutral Citation

kas

To

1.The Addl. Chief Secretary to the Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai
O/o.Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai – 600 007.

Page 7 of 8



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.563 of 2024

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

kas

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Prohibition Enforcement Wing,
Triplicane,
Chennai Dist.

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

H.C.P.No.563 of 2024

26.04.2024