



H.C.P.No.2522 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 02.02.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.2522 of 2023

Logakumari

... Petitioner

Vs.

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Sankari Main Road, Linemedu, Gugai,
Salem-636 006.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Salem - 636 007.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Shevapet Police Station,
53C, Appu Chetty Street,
Shevapet, Salem - 636 004.

... Respondents



H.C.P.No.2522 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 relating to the Detention order passed by the second respondent bearing No.C.M.P.No.87/Goonda/Salem City/2023, dated 19.09.2023, detaining the detenu under Section 3(2) of Tamil Nadu Act, 14 of 1982, as a Goonda, quashing the same and consequently, setting the detenu Mr.Venkatasubramanian S/o.Venugopal, Male, aged 45 years, now detained at Central Prison, Salem, at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Bharathi

For Respondents : Mr.E. Raj Thilak,
Additional Public Prosecutor
assisted by Mr.C. Aravind

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by ***SUNDER MOHAN, J.***)

The petitioner, who is the wife of the detenu, Venkatasubramanian S/o.Venugopal, aged 45 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 19.09.2023 slapped on her husband, 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 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 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 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 accused was detained under Goondas Act and was incarcerated for a long period.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, this Court finds that the bail order relied upon by the Detaining Authority in C.M.P.No.346 of 2019, dated 02.02.2019, is not similar to the case on hand, since the accused therein was granted bail after recording the fact that the accused was detained under Goondas Act and was incarcerated for a long period. 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.”

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.



H.C.P.No.2522 of 2023

WEB COPY 7. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent in No.C.M.P.No.87/Goonda/Salem City/2023, dated 19.09.2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Venkatasubramanian S/o.Venugopal, aged 45 years, 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]

02.02.2024

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Internet: Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Anu



H.C.P.No.2522 of 2023

WEB COPY To

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Sankari Main Road, Linemedu, Gugai,
Salem-636 006.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Salem - 636 007.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Shevapet Police Station,
53C, Appu Chetty Street,
Shevapet, Salem - 636 004.

5.The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.

6.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2522 of 2023

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

Anu

H.C.P.No.2522 of 2023

02.02.2024