



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2491 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 01.02.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.2491 of 2023

Kavitha

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Secretary to Government,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.

2.District Magistrate and District Collector,
Cuddalore, Cuddalore District.

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

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Cuddalore.

5.The Inspector of Police,
Prohibition Enforcement Wing,
Chidambaram,
Cuddalore District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to



HCP.No.2491 of 2023

issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records connected with the order of the 2nd respondent herein concerned in C3/D.O./49/2023, dated 07.09.2023 and quash the order of detention passed therein by the 2nd respondent herein against the detenu and directing the respondents herein to produce the body and person of the detenu by name Monishraj, S/o.Gnanasammantham, male, aged about 20 years, now detained at Central Prison, Cuddalore, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Raghu Kousik
for Ms.T.Reena

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, who is the mother of the detenu Monishraj, aged 20 years, S/o.Gnanasammantham, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 07.09.2023 slapped on her son, branding him as "Drug Offender" 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



HCP.No.2491 of 2023

Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].

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 accused therein by recording the fact that the there was no previous case as against the 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.4762 of 2022, dated 22.09.2022, is not similar to the case on hand, since the accused therein was granted bail after recording the fact that no previous case was reported against the accused therein. However, it is admitted that there are two



HCP.No.2491 of 2023

adverse cases as against the detenu herein. Considering the nature of the 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



HCP.No.2491 of 2023

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.”

6. In view of the ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and in



HCP.No.2491 of 2023

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 07.09.2023 in C3/D.O./49/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Monishraj, aged 20 years, S/o.Gnanasammantham, 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]
01.02.2024

Index: Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Sni



HCP.No.2491 of 2023

To
WEB COPY

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.District Magistrate and District Collector,
Cuddalore, Cuddalore District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Cuddalore, Cuddalore District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Cuddalore.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Prohibition Enforcement Wing,
Chidambaram,
Cuddalore District.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2491 of 2023

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

Sni

H.C.P.No.2491 of 2023

01.02.2024