



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1850 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 02.01.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.1850 of 2023

Chithra

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Secretary to Government, Home,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Salem City, Salem.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Salem District.
4. The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Salem Town,
Salem District.

... 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



H.C.P.No.1850 of 2023

records pertaining to the order of detention passed in CMP.No.55/Sexual Offender/Salem City/2023, dated 22.06.2023 passed by the 2nd respondent and set aside the same and directing the respondents to produce the petitioner's son by name Manikandan son of Madeswaran about 25 years before this Court now confined in Central Prison, Slaem, and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner	:	Ms.R.Pandimeena
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, mother of the detenu Manikandan, S/o.Madeswaran, aged about 25 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent, dated 22.06.2023, slapped on her son, branding him as "Sexual Offender" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Sexual Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act,



H.C.P.No.1850 of 2023

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 mainly focused on the ground that the bail order relied upon by the Detaining Authority is not similar to the case on hand, as the offences against the accused therein in the similar case are one under Sections 341, 506(i) IPC and Sections 7 and 8 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012, whereas, the offences alleged against the detenu in the ground case are under Sections 3(d) r/w 4, 5(m)(i) r/w 6 of Protection of Child from Sexual Offences Act, 2012. Therefore, the learned counsel submitted that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority that the detenu is likely to be released on bail by relying upon the aforesaid case, suffers from non-application of mind.

4.On a perusal of the Booklet, this Court finds that, in the similar case



H.C.P.No.1850 of 2023

relied upon by the Detaining Authority, i.e., Sections 341, 506(i) IPC and Sections 7 and 8 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012, whereas, the offences alleged against the detenu in the ground case, i.e., Crime No.35 of 2023, are under Sections 3(d) r/w 4, 5(m)(i) r/w 6 of Protection of Child from Sexual Offences Act, 2012. However, this material aspect has not been considered by the Detaining Authority while relying upon the bail order in the said case to form an opinion that the detenu is likely to be released on bail. Therefore, this Court is of the view that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority that the detenue is likely to be released on bail, is irrational and 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

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 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



H.C.P.No.1850 of 2023

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 2nd respondent in CMP.No.55/Sexual Offender/Salem City/2023, dated 22.06.2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Manikandan, S/o.Madeswaran, aged about 25 years, 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]
02.01.2024

pvs

Internet : Yes

Index : Yes / No

Page 6 of 8



H.C.P.No.1850 of 2023

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

WEB COPY To

1. The Secretary to Government, Home,
The State of Tamil Nadu,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Salem City
Salem.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Salem District.
4. The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Salem Town,
Salem District
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1850 of 2023

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

pvs

H.C.P.No.1850 of 2023

02.01.2024