



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2357 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 08.03.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.2357 of 2023

Maragathamal

... Petitioner/Grandmother of the detenu

Vs.

1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009.

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

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison Puzhal, Chennai.

4.The Inspector of Police,
C-3, Sevenwells Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondents



HCP.No.2357 of 2023

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records pertaining to the order of detention passed by the second respondent in his proceedings in No.527/BCDFGISSSV/2023, dated 01.11.2023 and quash the same as illegal and produce the detenue, namely Tamilarasan, S/o.Ramalingam, aged 22 years, as Goonda, now he is confined at Central Prison Puzhal - II, Chennai before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Raja

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 grandmother of the detenu viz., Tamilarasan, S/o.Ramalingam, aged 22 years, confined at Central Prison Puzhal - II, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 01.11.2023 slapped on her grandson, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of



HCP.No.2357 of 2023

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].

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 submitted that the bail order in the similar case relied on by the Detaining Authority to arrive at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail, was obtained where the learned Public Prosecutor had no serious objection for grant of bail to the accused therein.

4. On a perusal of the Grounds of Detention, it is seen that the Detaining Authority had relied upon the order of bail passed in a similar case in CrI.M.P.No.8231 of 2018 by the learned Principal Sessions, Chennai, to arrive



HCP.No.2357 of 2023

at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail.

However, bail was granted to the accused in the similar case in Crl.O.P.No.8231 of 2018 dated 30.05.2018, as there was no objection on the side of the prosecution to release the accused therein on bail. It is in the said circumstances, this Court finds that the subjective satisfaction arrived at by the Detaining Authority suffers from non-application of mind. Hence, on the above ground, the Detention Order is liable to be quashed.

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'***, had 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:-



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2357 of 2023

“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 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.”



HCP.No.2357 of 2023

WEB COPY

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. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 01.11.2023 in No.527/BCDFGISSSV/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Tamilarasan, S/o.Ramalingam, aged 22 years, confined at Central Prison Puzhal - II, Chennai, 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]

08.03.2024

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Anu



HCP.No.2357 of 2023

WEB COPY

To

1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009.

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

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison Puzhal, Chennai.

4.The Inspector of Police,
C-3, Sevenwells Police Station,
Chennai.

5.The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.

6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2357 of 2023

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

Anu

H.C.P.No.2357 of 2023

08.03.2024