



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.466 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 22.04.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N. SENTHILKUMAR

H.C.P.No.466 of 2025

Jamuna

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.

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

3.The Superintendent,
Special Prison for Women,
Puzhal, Chennai-600 066.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Law and Order,
P-1-Puliyanthope Police Station,
Puliyanthope, Chennai-600 012.

... Respondents

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



H.C.P.No.466 of 2025

WEB COPY

issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent on 10.12.2024 in No.1211/BCDFGISSSV/2024 and to quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body of the detainee namely Asha @ Chandra, W/o.Jayavel, aged about 63 years, before this Court and set her at liberty.


For Petitioner : Mr.P.Syed Abdul Mashood

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the daughter-in-law of the detainee namely Asha @ Chandra aged about 63 years, W/o.Jayavel, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 10.12.2024 issued against her mother-in-law, branding her as "Drug Offender" 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



H.C.P.No.466 of 2025


[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 detainee 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 are seven previous cases as against the accused therein.

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.5272 of 2023, is not similar to the case on hand since the accused therein was granted bail after recording the fact that there are seven previous cases against him. However, it is admitted that there are 2 previous cases as against the



H.C.P.No.466 of 2025

WEB COPY

detenue 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 detenue 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 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 similar cases mentioning the date of the orders, the



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.466 of 2025

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



H.C.P.No.466 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 10.12.2024 in No.1211/BCDFGISSSV/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detainee viz., Asha @ Chandra, aged about 63 years, W/o.Jayavel, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R, J.]

[N.S, J.]

22.04.2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking order/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Sni



H.C.P.No.466 of 2025

WEB COPY

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

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

3.The Superintendent,
Special Prison for Women,
Puzhal, Chennai-600 066.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Law and Order,
P-1-Puliyanthope Police Station,
Puliyanthope, Chennai-600 012.

5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.466 of 2025

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

Sni

H.C.P.No.466 of 2025

22.04.2025