



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2184 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 14.02.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.2184 of 2023

Lakshmi

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
St.George Fort, Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai – 600 007.

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai - 66.

4.The Inspector of Police,
J-7, Velacherry Police Station,
Velacherry,
Chennai.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to
issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records leading to



HCP.No.2184 of 2023

detention of the petitioner's son who is detained as GOONDA at 3rd respondent/Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai by the 2nd respondent's order BCDFGISSSV No.456/2023 dated 10.10.2023 and quash the same as illegal and consequently, direct the 4th respondent to produce the body of the detenu Chithiraiselvan, S/o.Chellapandi, aged about 36 years from the 3rd respondent before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.Om Sai Ram

For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak,
Additional Public Prosecutor
assisted by Mr.C. Aravind

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the mother of the detenu Chithiraiselvan, aged about 36 years, S/o.Chellapandi, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 10.10.2023 slapped on her son, branding him as "Goonda" 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, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].



HCP.No.2184 of 2023

WEB COPY

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 the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner pointed out that the Detaining Authority has not applied its mind while expressing its 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 detenu (accused therein) by recording the fact that there was no previous case as against the detenu (accused therein).

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, this Court finds that the bail order relied upon by the Detaining Authority in CrI.M.P.No.2697 of 2023, dated 06.02.2023, is not similar to the case on hand, since the detenu herein was the accused therein and he was granted bail after recording the fact that he has no previous case against him. However, it is admitted that now there are three adverse cases against the detenu. Considering the nature of the



HCP.No.2184 of 2023

bail order in the similar case relied upon by the Detaining Authority and the case on hand, this Court finds that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority that the detenu is also likely to be released on bail, 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 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,



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2184 of 2023

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 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.



HCP.No.2184 of 2023

WEB COPY

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 10.10.2023 in BCDFGISSSV No.456/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Chithiraiselvan, aged about 36 years, S/o.Chellapandi, 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]
14.02.2024

Index: Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Sni



HCP.No.2184 of 2023

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
St.George Fort, Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai – 600 007.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai - 66.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
J-7, Velacherry Police Station,
Velacherry, Chennai.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2184 of 2023

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

Sni

H.C.P.No.2184 of 2023

14.02.2024