



HCP.No.2491 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 24.10.2024

CORAM :

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM**  
**AND**  
**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM**

H.C.P.No.2491 of 2024

Vijaya

... Petitioner/Sister of the  
Detenu

***Vs.***

1. The Secretary to the Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,  
Secretariat,  
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,  
Greater Chennai.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison, Puzhal,  
Chennai District.
4. The Inspector of Police,  
S-7, Madipakkam Police Station,  
Chennai District.

... Respondents

**PRAYER:** Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records connected with the detention order in BCDFGISSSV No.833/2024 dated 09.08.2024 on the file of the respondent No.2 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce



HCP.No.2491 of 2024

the body and person of petitioner brother one named Mr.Bablu @ Shanmugam S/o. Munusamy aged about 37 years now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Muthamizhselvakumar  
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 09.08.2024 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.

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 statement under 161 Cr.P.C., said to have been made by the detenu's relative before the Sponsoring Authority, is not dated. Hence, the learned counsel for the petitioner raised a *bona fide* doubt as to when this statement was obtained from the petitioner's relative. The learned counsel further pointed out that, unless the statement relied upon by the Sponsoring Authority is immediately before the



HCP.No.2491 of 2024

Detention Order, it may not have relevance and hence, the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority based on this undated statement, would vitiate the Detention Order.

4. It is seen from records that the statement obtained by the Sponsoring Authority from the detenu's relative, enclosed in the Booklet, stating that they are planning to file a bail application to bring out the detenu on bail, is not dated. On a perusal of the Grounds of Detention, it is seen that, in Para No.4, the Detaining Authority has observed 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 application before the appropriate Court and has arrived at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail. When the statement obtained by the Sponsoring Authority from the relatives of the detenu stating that they are planning to file bail application to bring out the detenu on bail is not dated, the veracity of such statement becomes doubtful. The compelling necessity to detain the detenu would also depend on when the statement was obtained. In the absence of the date, the compelling necessity to detain, becomes suspect. Hence, this Court is of the view that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority based on such undated material, 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 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.*



HCP.No.2491 of 2024

WEB COPY

*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. More-so, two adverse cases are relied on by the detaining Authority and pertinently two cases are registered on same day i.e., on 10.07.2024 at 09.00 a.m. and 01.30 p.m. Though the adverse cases need not be disbelieved, the said cases would be insufficient to form an opinion that there is likelihood of causing breach of public order.

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 second respondent in proceedings BCDFGISSSV No.833/2024 dated 09.08.2024 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is **allowed**. The detenu viz.,



HCP.No.2491 of 2024

Bablu @ Shanmugam, aged 37 years, S/o. Munusamy confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

[S.M.S., J.] [V.S.G., J.]  
24.10.2024

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



HCP.No.2491 of 2024

To

1. The Secretary to the Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) 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.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison, Puzhal,  
Chennai District.
5. The Inspector of Police,  
S-7, Madipakkam Police Station,  
Chennai District.
6. The Public Prosecutor,  
Madras High Court,  
Chennai - 104.



WEB COPY



*HCP.No.2491 of 2024*

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

veda

H.C.P.No.2491 of 2024

24.10.2024