



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2504 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21.03.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.2504 of 2023

Bharathi

...Petitioner

Vs.

1. State of Tamil Nadu

Represented by the Additional Chief Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.

2. The Commissioner of Police

Greater Chennai, Vepery, Chennai 600 007.

3. The Inspector of Police

K-2, Ayanavaram Colony Police Station,
Chennai.

4. The Superintendent of Prison,

Central Prison-II,
Puzhal, Chennai 600 066.

...Respondents.

Prayer : Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the



H.C.P.No.2504 of 2023

records relating to the detention order in Memo No.584/BCDFGISSSV/2023 dated 15.11.2023 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondent to produce the petitioner's husband Sathya, S/o.Vinayagamoorthy, aged about 24 years the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.R. Muthukumar
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 Sathya, aged about 24 years, S/o.Vinayagamoorthy, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 15.11.2023 slapped on her husband, branding him as "Goonda" as contemplated under Section 2(f) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982.

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



WEB COPY

3. Though several points have been raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the detention order is liable to be quashed on the sole ground that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority regarding the possibility of the detenu coming out on bail by relying upon the bail order granted to the accused in a similar case, suffers from non-application of mind.

4. The Detaining Authority had relied upon an order passed in CrI.M.P. No.8322/2022 by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai, to infer that bail is likely to be granted to the detenu. However, on perusal of the order passed in CrI.M.P. No.8322/2022 dated 25.05.2022 this Court finds that there are only one previous case against the accused therein and hence, the bail was granted to him, whereas, in the instant case, the detenu has two previous cases. 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.2504 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. In view of the aforesaid reason, the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 15.11.2023 in No.584/BCDFGISSSV/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Sathya, aged 24 years, S/o. Vinayagamoorthis, 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]
21.03.2024**

bga

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

Page 5 of 7



H.C.P.No.2504 of 2023

To

WEB COPY

1. The Additional Chief Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai, Vepery, Chennai 600 007.
3. The Inspector of Police
K-2, Ayanavaram Colony Police Station,
Chennai.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison-II,
Puzhal, Chennai 600 066.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
6. The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2504 of 2023

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

bga

-

H.C.P.No.2504 of 2023

21.03.2024