



H.C.P.No.2413 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 23.02.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.2413 of 2023

M. Pugalenthir

...Petitioner/ Detenu

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
represented by its
Principal Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.
2. District Magistrate and District Collector,
Erode-638 011, Erode District.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Erode District, Erode 638 001.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Coimbatore 641 018.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Erode North Police Station,
Crime No.399 of 2023
Erode District.

...Respondents



H.C.P.No.2413 of 2023

Prayer : Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to produce the body of the detenu by name Pugalenth, Son of Marimuthu, aged 23 years, presently confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore, before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty forthwith, after calling for the records pertaining to the detention order dated 19.10.2023 in Cr.M.P. No.28/Goonda/2023 C1 passed by the 2nd respondent, quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr. N. Manokaran

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, Pugalenth, Son of Marimuthu, aged 23 years, who is the detenu, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 19.10.2023 slapped on him 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].



H.C.P.No.2413 of 2023

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

3. The detention order is liable to be quashed on the sole ground that the subjective satisfaction arrived at by the Detaining Authority regarding the imminent possibility of the detenu coming on bail, suffers from non-application of mind.

4. The Detaining Authority had relied upon an order passed in CrI.M.P.No.279 of 2023 by the learned Principal District Sessions Judge Erode, to infer that bail is likely to be granted to the detenu. However, on perusal of the order passed in CrI.M.P.No.279 of 2023, this Court finds that there are no previous cases against the accused therein and hence, the bail was granted to him, whereas, in the instant case, the detenu has one previous case. Therefore, the said order relied upon by the Detaining Authority to infer that in similar cases bail has been granted, suffers from non application of mind, since the accused therein was not on a similar footing as that of the detenu. This issue is also covered by the Hon'ble



Supreme Court in ***Rekha Vs. State of Tamil Nadu through Secretary to***

Government and Another reported in ***2011 [5] SCC 244***. The relevant

observations are as follows:-

"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.



H.C.P.No.2413 of 2023

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."

5. 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.

6. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 19.10.2023 in Cr.M.P. No.28/Goonda/2023 C1 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Pugalenth, aged 23 years S/o.Marimuthu, 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]
23.02.2024

bga

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

Page 5 of 7



H.C.P.No.2413 of 2023

To

WEB COPY

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
represented by its
Principal Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.
2. District Magistrate and District Collector,
Erode-638 011, Erode District.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Erode District, Erode 638 001.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Coimbatore 641 018.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Erode North Police Station,
Crime No.399 of 2023
Erode District.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
7. The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2413 of 2023

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

bga

H.C.P.No.2413 of 2023

23.02.2024