



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2310 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 03.01.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.2310 of 2023

Radhika @ Rasathi

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.

2.District Collector and District Magistrate of Chengalpattu District,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Chengalpattu, Chengalpattu District.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Chengalpattu, Chengalpattu District.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.

5.The Inspector of Police,
Madurantakam Police Station,
Chengalpattu District.

... Respondents

Prayer: Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the



H.C.P.No.2310 of 2023

Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the detention order in CPT.No.48/2023, dated 02.08.2023 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's son LOGESHWARAN @ LOGESH S/O. SIVARAMAN aged about 22 years the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S. Prem Kumar

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 herein is the mother of the detenu Logeshwaran @ Logesh, S/o. Sivaraman, aged 22 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 02.08.2023 slapped on her son, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned



H.C.P.No.2310 of 2023

Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

WEB COPY

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 accused therein on the ground that the co-accused was granted bail.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, this Court finds that the bail order passed in the case relied upon by the Detaining Authority, in CrI.M.P.No.1588/2019, dated 29.03.2019, is not similar to the case on hand, since the accused therein was released on bail mainly on the ground that the co-accused was granted bail. Therefore, this Court finds that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority is irrational and the detention order is liable to quashed on the ground of non-application of mind.

5. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the case of ***Rekha Vs. State of***



H.C.P.No.2310 of 2023

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. In the instant case, the Detaining Authority has arrived at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail by referring to a bail order granted to the accused in a similar case, wherein, the co-accused of the accused was granted bail. Therefore, the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority that the detenu is likely to be released on bail suffers from non-application of mind. 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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2310 of 2023

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.

7. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second



H.C.P.No.2310 of 2023

respondent, in CPT.No.48/2023, dated 02.08.2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Logeshwaran @ Logesh, S/o. Sivaraman, aged 22 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]

03.01.2024

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Internet: Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Sni



H.C.P.No.2310 of 2023

To
WEB COPY

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.District Collector and District Magistrate of Chengalpattu District,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Chengalpattu, Chengalpattu District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Chengalpattu, Chengalpattu District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Madurantakam Police Station,
Chengalpattu District.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2310 of 2023

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

Sni

H.C.P.No.2310 of 2023

03.01.2024