



WEB COPY



HCP.No.100 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 03.02.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

H.C.P.No.100 of 2025

UMA

W/o. Karuppasamy, No.4/83, Karvadi, Tirunellipatti
Post, Marugapuri Taluk, Trichy.

Petitioner(s) /mother of the detenue

Vs

1.State Rep By
The Secretary To The Government, Home Prohibition
And Excise Department, Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.

2. The District Magistrate And District Collector
Tirupur, Tiruppur District.

3. The Superintendent Of Police
Tirupur, Tiruppur District.

4. The Superintendent
Central Prison,
Coimbatore.

5. State Rep By
Inspector Of Police,
Kangayam Police Station,
Tirupur.

Respondent(s)



HCP.No.100 of 2025

WEB COPY

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, call for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the 2nd respondent dated 27.11.2024 in Cr.M.P.No.103/GOONDA/2024 against the petitioner son Sabari Vijay M/25 years S/o. Karuppasamy who is confined at Central Prison Coimbatore and set aside the same and consequently direct the respondents to produce the detenue before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Saranraj

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor
assisted by Mr.M.Sylvester John

ORDER

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

The petitioner herein, who is the mother of the detenu, Sabari Vijay M/25 years, S/o. Karuppasamy, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 27.11.2024 slapped on her son, 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



HCP.No.100 of 2025

Pirates Act, 1982 [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 bail order relied upon by the Detaining Authority is not similar to the case on hand, by referring to the fact that bail was granted to the accused therein mainly on the ground that the co-accused was granted bail. Therefore, the learned counsel submitted 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.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, this Court finds that, in the similar case relied upon by the Detaining Authority, i.e., CrI.M.P.No.2267 of 2021, the accused therein was granted bail mainly on the ground that the co-accused had been granted bail. This apart, the detenu has got four adverse cases and two previous cases. Hence, this Court is of the view that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority that the detenu is also



likely to be released on bail, by relying upon the aforesaid similar case, 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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.100 of 2025

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.



HCP.No.100 of 2025

7. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 27.11.2024 in Cr.M.P.No.103/GOONDA/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Sabari Vijay, M/25 years S/o. Karuppasamy, confined at Central Prison Coimbatore, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R., J] [N.S., J]
03.02.2025

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


To

1. The Secretary To The Government, Home
Prohibition And Excise Department, Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.

2. The District Magistrate And District Collector
Tirupur, Tiruppur District.

3. The Superintendent Of Police
Tirupur, Tiruppur District.

4. The Superintendent
Central Prison,
Coimbatore.



HCP.No.100 of 2025

5. Inspector Of Police,
Kangeyam Police Station,
Tirupur.

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

7. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

WEB COPY



WEB COPY



HCP.No.100 of 2025

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.
Anu

H.C.P.No.100 of 2025

03.02.2025