



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1665 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 29.07.2024

CORAM :

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

**H.C.P.No.1665 of 2024**

Thirumalai

... Petitioner

***Vs.***

1.State of Tamil Nadu, represented by  
The Secretary to Government,  
Department of Home, Prohibition and Excise,  
Secretariat, Fort St.George,  
Chennai.

2.The Commissioner of Police,  
Greater Chennai,  
Office of Commissioner of Police,  
Vepery, Chennai – 7.

3.Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison – Puzhal-II,  
Puzhal, Chennai.

4.Inspector of Police,  
D-2 Anna Salai Police Station,  
Chennai.

... Respondents



HCP.No.1665 of 2024

WEB COPY

**PRAYER:** Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records in Memo No.152/BCDFGISSSV/2024 passed by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent on 01.03.2024, on the file of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondent to produce the petitioner Thirumalai Son of Balaji aged about 50 years, before this Hon'ble Court, who now detained in Central Prison, Puzhal – II, Chennai and set him liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Palani

For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan,  
Additional Public Prosecutor

### **ORDER**

**M.S.RAMESH, J.**

**AND**

**SUNDER MOHAN, J.**

The petitioner herein, who is the detenu viz., Thirumalai, S/o.Balaji, aged 50 years, detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 01.03.2024, slapped on him, branding him as "GOONDA" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders,



HCP.No.1665 of 2024

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 filed by the Investigating Officer is not dated. Hence, the learned counsel raised a *bona fide* doubt as to when 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 Authority based on this undated document, would vitiate the Detention Order.



HCP.No.1665 of 2024

WEB COPY

4. It is seen from the records that the Special Report of the Sponsoring Authority is not dated. When the Special Report of the Sponsoring Authority is not dated, 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 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



HCP.No.1665 of 2024

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 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*



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1665 of 2024

*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 01.03.2024 in No.152/BCDFGISSSV/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Thirumalai, S/o.Balaji, aged 50 years, detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, 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]

29.07.2024

Index: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Tsg



HCP.No.1665 of 2024

WEB COPY

***Note:-Registry shall forthwith return the booklet containing the materials, on which, the Detaining Authority has placed reliance, to the petitioner/counsel for the petitioner with due acknowledgment.***

To

1.State of Tamil Nadu, represented by  
The Secretary to Government,  
Department of Home, Prohibition and Excise,  
Secretariat, Fort St.George,  
Chennai.

2.The Commissioner of Police,  
Greater Chennai,  
Office of Commissioner of Police,  
Vepery, Chennai – 7.

3.Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison – Puzhal-II,  
Puzhal, Chennai.

4.Inspector of Police,  
D-2 Anna Salai Police Station,  
Chennai.

5.The Public Prosecutor,  
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



*HCP.No.1665 of 2024*

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

Tsg

**H.C.P.No.1665 of 2024**

**29.07.2024**