



HCP.No.2312 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 29.10.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

H.C.P.No.2312 of 2024

Hemalatha

... Petitioner/Mother of
the Detenu

Vs.

1. The Government of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by its Additional Chief Secretary
to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Vepery, Chennai - 07.
3. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai - 600 066.
4. Inspector of Police,
V-5, Thirumangalam Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondents



HCP.No.2312 of 2024

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for records relating to the proceedings of the 2nd respondent in B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V.No.842/2024 dated 13.08.2024 against the petitioner's son Hari @ Hariharan, Male, aged about 22, S/o. Manohar and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the detenu, who is detained under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 currently confined at Central Prison, Puzhal before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Dhilipan

For Respondents : Mr. E. Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The preventive detention order passed by the second respondent dated 13.08.2024 is sought to be quashed in the present habeas corpus petition.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.



HCP.No.2312 of 2024

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 of the Sponsoring Authority is not dated. Hence, the learned counsel raised a *bona fide* doubt as to when the documents were obtained and as to the date on which 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 these undated documents, would vitiate the Detention Order.

4. On a perusal of the Grounds of Detention, it is seen that, in Para No.4, the Detaining Authority has stated that the Sponsoring Authority has stated that he came to understand that the relatives of the detenu are taking steps to take him out on bail by filing bail applications before the



HCP.No.2312 of 2024

appropriate Court and has arrived at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail. 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.2312 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.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2312 of 2024

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. We have gone through the nature of adverse case and ground case. All such cases can be dealt with under the regular penal law. Since the cases relied on can be dealt with by the Police Authorities under regular penal law, invoking preventive detention law become unnecessary in the present case.

7. 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.

8. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent,



HCP.No.2312 of 2024

in proceedings No.842/BCDFGISSSV/2024 date 13.08.2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is **allowed**. The detenu viz., Hari @ Hariharan, aged 22 years, S/o. Manohar confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless he is required in connection with any other case.

[S.M.S., J.] [V.S.G., J.]
29.10.2024

Index : Yes/No
Speaking Order : Yes/No
Neutral Citation : Yes/No
veda



HCP.No.2312 of 2024

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary
to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and Order) Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 9.
3. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Vepery, Chennai - 07.
4. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai - 600 066.
5. Inspector of Police,
V-5, Thirumangalam Police Station,
Chennai.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai - 104.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2312 of 2024

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
AND
V.SIVAGNANAM, J.

veda

H.C.P.No.2312 of 2024

29.10.2024