



H.C.P.No.329 of 2025

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 11.06.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.329 of 2025

Nagaraj

... Petitioner

Vs.

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

2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Namakkal District, Namakkal.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Namakkal District, Namakkal.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Salem
Salem District.

5.The Inspector of Police,
Velagoundampatty Police Station,
Namakkal District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to



H.C.P.No.329 of 2025

issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records pertaining to the order of detention passed in C.M.P.No.5/GOONDA/2025/(M1) dated 29.01.2025 by the 2nd respondent and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's son in law namely Dinesh, aged about 32 years, S/o.Ramasamy, before this Court, now confined in Central Prison, Salem and set him at liberty.


For Petitioner : Mr.C.Deepakkumar

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 in law of the detenu namely Dinesh, aged about 32 years, S/o.Ramasamy, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 29.01.2025 issued against his son in law, 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



H.C.P.No.329 of 2025


Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].

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 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 only by referring to Covid-19 pandemic.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, this Court finds that the bail order passed in the case relied upon by the Detaining Authority, in C.M.P.No.74/2021, dated 26.05.2021, is not similar to the case on hand, since the accused therein was released on bail mainly by citing Covid-19 pandemic. Therefore, this Court finds that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority is irrational and the detention order



H.C.P.No.329 of 2025

is liable to quashed on the ground of non-application of mind.

WEB COPY

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. In the instant case, the Detaining Authority has arrived at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail by referring to a bail order granted to the accused in a similar case, wherein, the said bail was granted mainly by citing Covid-19 Pandemic. Therefore, the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority that the detenu is likely to be released on bail suffers from non-application of mind. 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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.329 of 2025

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



H.C.P.No.329 of 2025

order is liable to be quashed.

WEB COPY

7. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 29.01.2025 in C.M.P.No.5/GOONDA/2025/(M1), is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Dinesh, aged about 32 years, S/o.Ramasamy, 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.]

11.06.2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking order/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Sni



H.C.P.No.329 of 2025

WEB COPY

- To
- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009.
 - 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Namakkal District, Namakkal.
 - 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Namakkal District, Namakkal.
 - 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Salem
Salem District.
 - 5.The Inspector of Police,
Velagoundampatty Police Station,
Namakkal District.
 - 6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
 - 7.The Joint Secretary, Public (Law & Order),
Chennai – 600 009.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.329 of 2025

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

Sni

H.C.P.No.329 of 2025

11.06.2025