



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.724 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 24.04.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.724 of 2024

Surendhar

... Petitioner/brother of the detenue

Vs.

1.The State of Tamilnadu,
Represented by Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009.

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

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Mailaduthurai District,
Mailaduthurai.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Thiruchirappalli.

5.The Inspector of Police,
Sirkazhi Police Station,
Mailaduthurai District.

... Respondents



H.C.P.No.724 of 2024

Prayer : Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records relating to the detention order dated 08.12.2023 passed by the second respondent in his proceedings No.C.O.C.No.55 of 2023 and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's brother namely Rajkumar, son of Mathiyazhagan, aged about 22 years, who is presently under going detention in the Central Prison, Thiruchirappalli as Bootlegger before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Vinoth

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, who is the brother of the detenu viz., Rajkumar, son of Mathiyazhagan, aged about 22 years, detained at Central Prison, Thiruchirappalli, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 08.12.2023 slapped on his brother, branding him as "Bootlegger" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].



WEB COPY 2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

3. Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner pointed out that the Detaining Authority has not applied its mind while expressing its subjective satisfaction that the detenu is also likely to be released on bail. It is his submission that the case relied upon by the Detaining Authority is not similar to the present case, as the bail was granted in favour of the accused therein by recording the fact that there were no bad antecedents reported as against the accused therein.

4. Upon a perusal of the Booklet, this Court finds that the detaining authority has relied on an order passed in CrI.M.P.No.997 of 2022 dated 25.04.2022, subject to the satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail. In that case, the accused had no bad antecedents; however, as per the remand report furnished to the detenu in the booklet, the detenu has three adverse cases. Therefore, the order relied upon by the detaining authority cannot be said to be similar, the satisfaction of the



detaining authority is vitiated and suffers from non-application of mind.

WEB COPY

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 paragraphs 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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.724 of 2024

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.

7. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent in C.O.C.No.55 of 2023, dated 08.12.2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz.,



H.C.P.No.724 of 2024

Rajkumar, son of Mathiyazhagan, aged about 22 years, detained at Central Prison, Thiruchirappalli, 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]

24.04.2024

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Internet: Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Anu

To

1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009.

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

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Mailaduthurai District,
Mailaduthurai.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Thiruchirappalli.

5.The Inspector of Police,



H.C.P.No.724 of 2024

Sirkazhi Police Station,
Mailaduthurai District.

WEB COPY

6.The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.

7.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.724 of 2024

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

Anu

H.C.P.No.724 of 2024

24.04.2024