



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2509 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 26.02.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.2509 of 2023

V.Ramani

... Petitioner/mother of the detenue

Vs.

1.The State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.

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

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

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

5.The Inspector of Police,
Kullanchavadi Police Station,
Chennai-600 117.

... Respondents



H.C.P.No.2509 of 2023

Prayer : Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records in C3/D.O./66/2023 dated 19.10.2023 on the file of the second respondent and quash the same as illegal and consequently, direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's son viz., Thiru. Balaji aged 23 years, S/o.Velu, who is now confined at Central Prison, Cuddalore before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Vijayakumar

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, who is the mother of the detenu, Balaji aged 23 years, S/o.Velu, confined at Central Prison, Cuddalore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 19.10.2023 slapped on her son, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982



H.C.P.No.2509 of 2023

[Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].

WEB COPY

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 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 investigation was almost completed. Further, the Sections under which the accused therein was charged are not similar to the Sections charged against the petitioner herein.

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.4791 of 2018, dated 28.09.2018, is not similar to the case on hand, since the accused therein was granted bail after recording the fact that the investigation was almost completed. Further, the Sections under which the accused therein



H.C.P.No.2509 of 2023

was charged are not similar to the Sections charged against the petitioner herein. However, it is admitted that there is three 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 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.”



H.C.P.No.2509 of 2023

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. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent in C3/D.O./66/2023, dated 19.10.2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Balaji aged 23 years, S/o.Velu, confined at Central Prison, Cuddalore, 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]

26.02.2024

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Anu



H.C.P.No.2509 of 2023

WEB COPY To

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Cuddalore District,
Cuddalore.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Cuddalore District,
Cuddalore.
4. The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Cuddalore-4.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Kullanchavadi Police Station,
Chennai-600 117
6. The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.
7. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2509 of 2023

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

Anu

H.C.P.No.2509 of 2023

26.02.2024