



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.224 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 04.06.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.224 of 2025

P.Sakthivel

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.

2.District Magistrate and District Collector,
Kallakurichi District,
Kallakurichi.

3.Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Cuddalore.

4.Superintendent of Police,
Kallakurichi District.

5.Inspector of Police,
Elavanasoor Kottai Police Station,
Ulundurpet Circle,
Kallakurichi District.

... Respondents



H.C.P.No.224 of 2025

WEB COPY

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records, relating to the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 06.01.2025 in D.O.No.C2/02/2025, against the petitioner's son/detenu namely Vijay, S/o.Sakthivel, aged about 29 years, now confined at Central Prison, Cuddalore and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce him before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Gangadaran

For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by *M.S. RAMESH, J.*)

The petitioner herein, who is the father of the detenu namely Vijay, aged about 29 years, S/o.Sakthivel, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 06.01.2025 issued against his 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 Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].




H.C.P.No.224 of 2025

WEB COPY

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

3. Though several grounds have been raised in the Habeas Corpus Petition, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would mainly focus his arguments on the ground that the Detaining Authority has relied upon the order passed in C.M.P.No.3907 of 2024 dated 20.12.2024 and came to the conclusion that in a similar case bail has been granted and that there is a likelihood of the detenu also to be released on bail. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the order relied upon by the Detaining Authority is not similar, as the offences in the similar case are different from the detenu's case and therefore, there is a non-application of mind on the part of the Detaining Authority.

4. On a perusal of the Grounds of Detention and the booklet, it is seen that in the order that was relied upon by the Detaining Authority in C.M.P.No.3907 of 2024 dated 20.12.2024, the accused therein was enlarged on bail for the offences under Sections 305 & 331(4) of BNS. However, in the present case, the offences involved are under Sections



H.C.P.No.224 of 2025

WEB COPY

331(4) & 305(A) of BNS, which are not similar to the case relied upon by the Detaining Authority. It is in the said circumstances, this Court finds that the subjective satisfaction arrived at by the Detaining Authority suffers from non-application of mind, as the offences involved in the similar case is distinctive from the detenu's case. Hence, on the above ground, the Detention Order is liable to be quashed.

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 paragraph Nos.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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.224 of 2025

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.224 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 on 06.01.2025 in D.O.No.C2/02/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Vijay, aged about 29 years, S/o.Sakthivel, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R, J.]

[V.L.N, J.]

04.06.2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking order/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Sni



H.C.P.No.224 of 2025

WEB COPY

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.

2.District Magistrate and District Collector,
Kallakurichi District,
Kallakurichi.

3.Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Cuddalore.

4.Superintendent of Police,
Kallakurichi District.

5.Inspector of Police,
Elavanasoor Kottai Police Station,
Ulundurpet Circle,
Kallakurichi District.

6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

7.The Joint Secretary, Public (Law & Order),
Chennai – 600 009.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.224 of 2025

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

Sni

H.C.P.No.224 of 2025

04.06.2025