



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1289 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 11.01.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.1289 of 2023

Rajeshwari

...Petitioner/Wife of the Detenu

Vs.

1. State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. By the Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Avadi City, Chennai – 600 054.
3. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.
4. The Inspector of Police,
T-16, Nazarathpet Police Station,
Chennai. ...Respondents.

Prayer : Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records, relating to the detention order in



H.C.P.No.1289 of 2023

Memo No.147/BCDFGISSSV/2023, dated 13.06.2023 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's husband Udhayakumar S/o. Ravichandran aged about 28 years, the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Ravindran
For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor
assisted by
Mr.C.Aravind

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by **M.S.RAMESH, J.**)

The petitioner, wife of the detenu Udhayakumar S/o. Ravichandran aged about 28 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 13.06.2023 slapped on her husband, branding him as “Goonda“ 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].

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



WEB COPY

3. Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner pointed out that the Detaining Authority has not applied his mind while expressing his 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 only by referring to Covid~19 pandemic.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, this Court finds that the bail order passed in the case relied upon by the Detaining Authority, in CrI.M.P.No.10485 of 2021, dated 26.05.2021, is not similar to the case on hand, since the accused therein was released on bail mainly by citing Covid~19. Therefore, this Court finds that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority is irrational and the detention order is liable to be quashed on the ground of non~application of mind.

5. The Hon-ble Supreme Court, in the case of ***Rekha Vs. State of***



H.C.P.No.1289 of 2023

Tamil Nadu through Secretary to Government and Another reported in

WEB CC

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. In the instant case, the Detaining Authority has arrived at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail by referring to a bail order, wherein, the accused therein was granted bail mainly by citing Covid-19 Pandemic. The said case cannot be said to be similar. Therefore, the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority that the detenu is likely to be released on bail suffers from non-application of mind. 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 No.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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1289 of 2023

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.

7.In view of the aforesaid reason, the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent in No.147/BCDFGISSSV/2023, dated 13.06.2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Udhayakumar S/o. Ravichandran aged about 28 years, is directed to be set



H.C.P.No.1289 of 2023

at liberty forthwith unless he is required in connection with any other case.

WEB COPY

ars

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

[M.S.R., J] [S.M., J]
11.01.2024



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1289 of 2023

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

ars

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Avadi City, Chennai – 600 054.
3. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.
4. The Inspector of Police,
T-16, Nazarathpet Police Station,
Chennai.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras,
Chennai – 600 104.

H.C.P.No.1289 of 2023



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1289 of 2023

11.01.2024