



HCP.No.954 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.06.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.954 of 2024

Venkatesan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Additional Chief Secretary
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tambaram City
Office of the Commissioner of Police
Tambaram

3.The Superintendent,
Special Prison for Women
Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.

4.The Inspector of Police,
PEW Guduvancherry Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondents



HCP.No.954 of 2024

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records pertaining to the order of detention dated 08.01.2024 passed by the second respondent herein and made in BCDFGISSSV No.1/2024 and to set aside the same and directing the third respondent to produce the detenu, the petitioner's mother, K.Dhanalakshmi W/o.Kaliyaperumal, now confined in Special Prison for Women, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and thereby setting her at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Sakthivel

For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the son of the detenu viz. K.Dhanalakshmi, aged about 54 years, W/o.Kaliaperumal, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 08.01.2024 slapped on his mother, branding her as "DRUG OFFENDER" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest



HCP.No.954 of 2024

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 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, as well as the entire pages of the paper booklet furnished by the Detaining Authority, are 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 placed before the Detention Order, it



HCP.No.954 of 2024

may not have any relevance and hence, the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining 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. hence, the veracity of the Report becomes doubtful. The compelling necessity to detain the detenu 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 ***'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



HCP.No.954 of 2024

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 case. A mere ipse dixit statement in the grounds of detention cannot sustain the detention



WEB COPY



HCP.No.954 of 2024

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 08.01.2024 in BCDFGISSSV No.1/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., K.Dhanalakshmi, aged 54 years, W/o.Kaliaperumal, 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]
27.06.2024



HCP.No.954 of 2024

kas
To

WEB COPY

1.The Additional Chief Secretary
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tambaram City
Office of the Commissioner of Police
Tambaram

3.The Superintendent,
Special Prison for Women
Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.

4.The Inspector of Police,
PEW Guduvancherry Police Station,
Chennai.

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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.954 of 2024

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

kas

H.C.P.No.954 of 2024

27.06.2024