



H.C.P.No.48 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 18.03.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.48 of 2024

P. Saravanan

...Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by its
Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police, Greater Chennai
Detaining Authority,
Chennai City Commissionerate,
EVP Salai, Vepery, Chennai.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison-II, Puzhal,
Chennai 600 066.
4. The Inspector of Police,
R-10, MGR Nagar Police Station,
Chennai City.

...Respondents



H.C.P.No.48 of 2024

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 records in connection with the order of detention passed by the second respondent dated 09.11.2023 in BCDFGISSSV No.568/2023 against the petitioner's brother Prakash aged about 41 years, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr. A.Arul Alex

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 brother of the detenu, namely Prakash, aged 33 years, S/o. Pichaikannan, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 09.11.2023 slapped on his brother branding him as "Goonda" 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 Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].



H.C.P.No.48 of 2024

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

3. The detention order is liable to be quashed on the sole ground that the subjective satisfaction arrived at by the Detaining Authority regarding the imminent possibility of the detenu coming on bail, suffers from non-application of mind.

4. The Detaining Authority had relied upon an order passed in CrI.M.P.No.13602 of 2023 by the learned Principal 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.13602 of 2023, this Court finds that there are no previous cases against the accused therein and hence, the bail was granted to him, whereas, in the instant case, the detenu has one previous case. 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.48 of 2024

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. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 09.11.2023 in BCDFGISSSV No.568/2023 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Prakash, aged 33 years S/o.Pichaikannan, 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]
18.03.2024**

bga
Index : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No



H.C.P.No.48 of 2024

To

WEB COPY

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by its
Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police, Greater Chennai
Detaining Authority,
Chennai City Commissionerate,
EVP Salai, Vepery, Chennai.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison-II, Puzhal,
Chennai 600 066.
4. The Inspector of Police,
R-10, MGR Nagar Police Station,
Chennai City.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
6. The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.48 of 2024

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

bga

H.C.P.No.48 of 2024

18.03.2024