



H.C.P.No.623 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 17.07.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH
AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.623 of 2025

Saritha

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State rep. by The Secretary to the Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat
Chennai-600 009.

2.District Collector and District Magistrate of
Ranipet District
Ranipet

3.The Superintendent of Police
Ranipet District
Ranipet

4.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison
Vellore 632 002

5.The Inspector of Police
Sipcot Police Station
Ranipet
Ranipet District

... Respondents



H.C.P.No.623 of 2025

Prayer: Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the entire records in connection with the order of detention passed by the second respondent dated 20.02.2025 in B3/D.O.No.15/2025 and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondent herein to produce the petitioner's son viz. A.Vishal, male, aged 19 years, S/o.Anandkumar, who is confined at Central Prison, Vellore and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Chandra Sekar

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner, who is the mother of the detenu viz., Vishal, aged about 19 years, S/o.Anandakumar, confined at Central Prison, Vellore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 20.02.2025 slapped on her son, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders,



H.C.P.No.623 of 2025

Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

3. Though several grounds have been raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the detention order is liable to be quashed on the sole ground that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority regarding the possibility of the detenu coming out on bail by relying upon the bail order granted to the accused in a similar case, suffers from non-application of mind.

4. On a perusal, it is seen that in paragraph 4 of the Grounds of Detention, the Detaining Authority has stated that there is a possibility of the detenu coming out on bail in the ground case since in a similar case i.e. in CrI.M.P.No.6 of 2025, bail was granted to the accused therein on 07.01.2025. On a perusal of the said order, in page Nos.69 to 71 of the Booklet in Volume II, this Court finds that the accused therein was remanded to judicial custody on jumped bail and thereafter was under



H.C.P.No.623 of 2025

custody for 138 days and hence he was released on bail and not on merits.

Therefore, it is not a similar case and the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority, regarding the possibility of the detenu coming out on bail suffers from non-application of mind, which vitiates the detention order. Hence, on this 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 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,



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.623 of 2025

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 order is liable to be quashed.

7. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent, in B3/D.O.No.15 of 2025, dated 20.02.2025, is hereby set



H.C.P.No.623 of 2025

aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Vishal,
aged about 19 years, S/o.Anandakumar, confined at Central Prison,
Vellore, 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.]

17.07.2025

kas

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking
Neutral Citation

To

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

2.District Collector and District Magistrate of
Ranipet District
Ranipet - 1

3.The Superintendent of Police
Ranipet District
Ranipet

4.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison
Vellore

5.The Inspector of Police

Page 6 of 8



H.C.P.No.623 of 2025

Sipcot Police Station
Ranipet District

WEB COPY

6.The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras
Chennai 600 104

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

kas



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.623 of 2025

H.C.P.No.623 of 2025

(4/4)

17.07.2025