



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.22 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 14.03.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.22 of 2024

Kowsalya

... Petitioner/detenue's wife

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu
Represented by its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Chennai City,
Vepery,
Chennai-600 007.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai-600 066.

4.The Inspector of Police,
H-3, Todiarpur Police Station,
Chennai-600 0081.

... Respondents



H.C.P.No.22 of 2024

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 entire records connected with the order of the second respondent herein concerned in No.569/BCDFGISSSV/2023 dated 09.11.2023 and quash the order of detention passed therein by the second respondent herein against the detenu and directing the respondents herein to produce the body and person of the detenu by name Rakesh @ Rakki, son of Ravi, aged about 25 years, now detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, before this Court and setting him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Raghavan

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 wife of the detenu viz., Rakesh @ Rakki, son of Ravi, aged about 25 years, now detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 09.11.2023 slapped on her husband, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders,



H.C.P.No.22 of 2024

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 there was only one previous case as against the accused therein, whereas, the detenu herein has got five adverse cases.

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.19198 of 2021, dated 27.10.2021, is not similar to the case on hand, since the accused therein was granted bail after recording the fact that was only one previous case reported against the accused therein. However, it is



H.C.P.No.22 of 2024

admitted that there are five 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.22 of 2024

WEB COPY 7. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent in No.569/BCDFGISSSV/2023 dated 09.11.2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Rakesh @ Rakki, son of Ravi, aged about 25 years, detained at Central Prison, Puzhal,, 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]

14.03.2024

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

Anu



H.C.P.No.22 of 2024

WEB COPY To

1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Chennai City,
Vepery,
Chennai-600 007.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai-600 066.

4.The Inspector of Police,
H-3, Todiarpur Police Station,
Chennai-600 0081.

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

6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.22 of 2024

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

Anu

H.C.P.No.22 of 2024

14.03.2024