



WEB COPY



HCP.No.606 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 06.06.2025

CORAM :

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH**

**AND**

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN**

**H.C.P.No.606 of 2025**

SANTHIYA

Petitioner(s) /wife of the detenue

Vs

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

2.The Commissioner Of Police  
Greater Chennai.

3.The Superintendent  
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

4.The Inspector Of Police (law And Order)  
C-1 Flower Bazaar Police Station, Chennai.

Respondent(s)

**PRAYER:** Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, directing the respondents to produce the detenu Thiru.Mahesh Son of Murugesan about 22 years, detained in central prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this court and to call for the records of



HCP.No.606 of 2025

detention order passed by the second respondent in No.24/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 13.01.2025 against petitioner husband Thiru.Mahesh son of Murugesan about 22 years and set aside the same and set the detenu at liberty.


For Petitioner : Mr.C.Jagan

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

### **ORDER**

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

The petitioner herein, who is the wife of the detenu, Mahesh, Son of Murugesan, aged about 22 years, detained in central prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 13.01.2025 issued against her husband, 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



HCP.No.606 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 this petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner focused mainly on the ground that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority that the relatives of the detenu are taking steps to take out the detenu on bail, suffers from non-application of mind, as the statements under 180(iii) of B.N.S.S, said to have been made by the detenu's relatives before the Sponsoring Authority, is not dated. Hence, the learned counsel for the petitioner raised a *bona fide* doubt as to when this statement was obtained from the detenue's relatives. The learned counsel further pointed out that, unless the statement relied upon by the Sponsoring Authority is immediately before the Detention Order, it may not have relevance and hence, the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority based on this undated statement, would vitiate the Detention Order.



WEB COPY

4. It is seen from records that the statement obtained by the Sponsoring Authority from the detenu's relatives, enclosed in the Booklet, stating that they are planning to file a bail application to bring out the detenu on bail, is not dated. On a perusal of the Grounds of Detention, it is seen that the Detaining Authority has observed that the Sponsoring Authority has stated that he came to understand that the relatives of the detenu are taking steps to take him out on bail by filing bail application before the appropriate Court and has arrived at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail. When the statements obtained by the Sponsoring Authority from the relatives of the detenu stating that they are planning to file bail application to bring out the detenu on bail, are not dated, the veracity of such statements becomes doubtful. The compelling necessity to detain the detenu would also depend on when the statements were obtained. In the absence of the date, the compelling necessity to detain, becomes suspect. Hence, this Court is of the view that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority based on such undated material, suffers from 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. 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 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*



WEB COPY




HCP.No.606 of 2025

*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.

**7.** Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 13.01.2025 in No.24/BCDFGISSSV/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Mahesh, Son of Murugesan, aged about 22 years, detained in central prison,



HCP.No.606 of 2025

Puzhal, Chennai, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case.

WEB COPY

[M.S.R., J]

[V.L.N., J]

06.06.2025

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,  
Chennai-600 009.
2. The Commissioner Of Police  
Greater Chennai.
3. The Superintendent  
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.
4. The Inspector Of Police (law And Order)  
C-1 Flower Bazaar Police Station, Chennai.

**M.S.RAMESH, J.**



WEB COPY



HCP.No.606 of 2025

**and**  
**V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.**  
***Anu***

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

6.The Public Prosecutor,  
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.606 of 2025

06.06.2025