



WEB COPY

HCP No. 660 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

**DATED: 23-04-2025**

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH  
AND  
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR**

**HCP No. 660 of 2025**

A.Ramesh

S/O. Amirtharaj, Door No 23, Periyar  
Nagar, 3rd Street, Kannappa Nagar(Po),  
Rathinapuri, Coimbatore District


Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. State of Tamil Nadu, Rep by the  
Secretary to Government  
Home Prohibition And Excise  
Department, Fort St George,  
Chennai 600 009

2.The Commissioner of Police  
Detaining Authority  
Office of the Commissioner of Police,  
Coimbatore City, Coimbatore.

3.The Superintendent of Prison  
Central Prison, Coimbatore,  
Coimbatore District



4. The Inspector of Police

B-5, Vadavalli Police Station,

Coimbatore District

Respondent(s)

**PRAYER**

To issue a Writ order or direction in the nature of a Habeas Corpus to call for the records relating to the Detention Order vide C.NO. 89/G/IS/2024 dated 30.07.2024 passed by the second Respondent and quash the same and direct the respondent herein to produce the petitioner detenu namely A.Ramesh S/o. Amirtharaj, aged 48 years (who is presently under going detention in the central Prison, Coimbatore ) before the honble Court and set him at liberty

For Petitioner : Mr. D. Prsanna

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


**ORDER**

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

**AND**

**N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.**

The petitioner / detenu viz. A. Ramesh, S/o.Amirtharaj, aged about 48 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 30.07.2024 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].




WEB COPY

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and 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 by recording the fact that there was no previous case 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.1710 of 2022 dated 11.04.2022 is not similar to the case on hand, since the accused therein was granted bail after recording the fact that no previous case was reported against the accused therein. However, it is admitted that there are three adverse cases and 10 previous cases as against the detenu 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 detenu 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 paragraphs 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 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*



WEB COPY

HCP No. 660 of 2025



*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 30.07.2024 in C.No.89/G/IS/2024 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., A.Ramesh, aged 48 years, S/o. Amirtharaj, confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case.

**(M.S.RAMESH J.) (N.SENTHILKUMAR J.)**

**23-04-2025**

ASI



To

1.State of Tamil Nadu, Rep by the  
Secretary to Government  
Home Prohibition And Excise  
Department, Fort St George, Chennai  
600 009

2.The Commissioner of Police  
Detaining Authority  
Office of the Commissioner of Police,  
Coimbatore City, Coimbatore.

3.The Superintendent of Prison  
Central Prison, Coimbatore,  
Coimbatore District

4.The Inspector of Police  
B 5, Vadavalli Police Station,  
Coimbatore District.

5. The Public Prosecutor  
High Court of Madras, Chennai.



WEB COPY

HCP No. 660 of 2025



**M.S.RAMESH J.**  
**AND**  
**N.SENTHILKUMAR J.**

ASI

**HCP No. 660 of 2025**

**23-04-2025**