



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1281 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 15.07.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.1281 of 2024

Jegadeswari

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Secretary to Government,
Ministry of Consumer Affairs,
Food and Public Distribution
(Department of Consumer Affairs)
room no.270, Krishi Bhavan,
New Delhi – 110 001.

2.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Food and Consumer Protection Department,
2nd Floor, Namakkal, Kavignar Maaligai,
Secretariat, Chennai – 09.

3.The Commissioner of Police,
Avadi City.

4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal.

5.The Inspector of Police,
Civil Supplies CID,
Chennai North Unit.

... Respondents



HCP.No.1281 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 passed by the 3rd respondent pertaining to the order made in Memo No.02/Black marketing act/2024 dated 23-03-2024 in detain the detenu under 3(2)(b) read with sec.3(1) of the prevention of black marketing and maintenance of supplies of Essential Commodities Act, 1980 (Central Act No.7 of 1980), as a BLACK MARKETEER and quash the same and direct the respondent to produce the detenu Chakkravarthy son of Murugesan aged about 53 years, who is detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Nirmal Krishnan
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 namely Chakkravarthy, aged about 53 years, S/o. Murugesan, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the third respondent dated 23.03.2024 slapped on her husband, branding him as "Black Marketeer" under the Prevention of Black Marketing and Maintenance of Supplies of Essential Commodities Act, 1980 (Central Act



HCP.No.1281 of 2024

No.7 of 1980).

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 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 is no previous case pending as against the accused therein.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, this Court finds that the bail order relied upon by the Detaining Authority in CrI.M.P.No.4071 of 2024, dated 19.03.2024, is not similar to the case on hand, since the accused therein was granted bail after recording the fact that there is no previous case pending against the accused therein. However, it is admitted that there is one adverse case as against the detenu herein. Considering the nature of the bail



HCP.No.1281 of 2024

order in the similar case relied upon by the Detaining Authority and the case on hand, this Court finds that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority that the detenu is also likely to be released on bail, 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'***, 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 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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1281 of 2024

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.

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the



HCP.No.1281 of 2024

third respondent on 23.03.2024 in No.02/Black Marketing Act/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Chakkravarthy, aged about 53 years, S/o. Murugesan, 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]

15.07.2024

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Tsg



HCP.No.1281 of 2024

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Ministry of Consumer Affairs,
Food and Public Distribution
(Department of Consumer Affairs)
room no.270, Krishi Bhavan,
New Delhi – 100 001.
- 2.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Food and Consumer Protection Department,
2nd Floor, Namakkal, Kavignar Maaligai,
Secretariat, Chennai – 09.
- 3.The Commissioner of Police,
Avadi City.
- 4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Civil Supplies CID,
Chennai North Unit.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1281 of 2024

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

Tsg

H.C.P.No.1281 of 2024

15.07.2024