



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2463 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 28.02.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.2463 of 2023

R. Rasathi

...Petitioner/ wife of the Detenu

Vs.

1. The Secretary to the Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
 2. District Collector and District Magistrate,
Ranipet District, Ranipet-1.
 3. The Superintendent of Police,
Ranipet District, Ranipet-1.
 4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Vellore.
 5. The Inspector of Police,
Arcot Taluk Police Station, Ranipet District.
- ...Respondents

Prayer : Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records in connection with the order of Detention passed by the second respondent dated 26.10.2023 in B3/D.O. No.49/2023 against the petitioner's



H.C.P.No.2463 of 2023

husband, Ravi, Male aged 48 years, S/o. Munusamy, who is confined at Central Prison, Vellore and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D. Balaji

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, wife of the detenu, Ravi, Male aged 48 years, S/o.Munusamy, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 26.10.2023, slapped on her husband, branding him as "Bootlegger" as contemplated under Section 2(b) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14/1982.

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

3. Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned



H.C.P.No.2463 of 2023

counsel for the petitioner contended 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 during COVID-19 situation and that placing reliance on such order shows the non-application of mind on the part of the Detaining Authority.

4. On a perusal of the Grounds of Detention, it is seen that the Detaining Authority had relied upon the order of bail in similar case in CrI.MP.No.1206/2021 passed by the Principal Sessions Court, Vellore. However, in the Booklet, it is seen that the bail order in the similar case was obtained during COVID-19 situation and bail was granted to the accused therein with a specific reference to COVID-19. It is in the said circumstances, this Court finds that the subjective satisfaction arrived at by the Detaining Authority to hold that the detenu is likely to be released on bail, suffers from non-application of mind. 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.

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.



H.C.P.No.2463 of 2023

WEB COPY

6. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 26.10.2023 in B3/D.O.No.49/2023 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Ravi, aged 48 years, Son of Munusamy, 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]
28.02.2024

bga

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No



H.C.P.No.2463 of 2023

To

WEB COPY

1. The Secretary to the Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
2. District Collector and District Magistrate,
Ranipet District, Ranipet-1.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Ranipet District, Ranipet-1.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Vellore.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Arcot Taluk Police Station, Ranipet District.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
7. The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2463 of 2023

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

bga

H.C.P.No.2463 of 2023

28.02.2024