



WEB COPY

HCP NO. 713 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: **04-07-2025**

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P NO. 713 of 2025

Prajjwal Prakash

S/o. Anurag Kumar Misra, Flat No.405, 2nd Floor, Meerabagh,
Paschism Vihar, West Delhi.

Petitioner(s)

Vs.

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

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Tambaram City.

3. The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
Cyber Crime Wing, Tambaram City.

4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the second respondent dated 27.03.2025 in Memo No.20/BCDFGISSSV/2025 against the petitioner's brother A.Prince Prakash @ Rahis, son of Anurag Kumar Mishra, aged about 25 years, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai and set aside the same and direct



the respondents to produce the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty.



For Petitioner : Mr.V.Parthiban

For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak

Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

M.S.RAMESH, J.


AND

V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

The petitioner, who is the brother of the detenu viz., A.Prince Prakash @ Rahis, aged about 25 years, S/o.Anurag Kumar Mishra, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 27.03.2025 slapped on his brother, branding him as "Cyber Law Offender" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, 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

WEB COPY

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 Cr.M.P.No.35 of 2025, bail was granted to the accused therein on 20.01.2025. On a perusal of the said order, in page Nos.113 and 115 of the Booklet in Volume I, this Court finds that the said order relates to release of the accused on bail u/s.167[2] of Cr.P.C. and the bail was granted to the accused therein since he had been in prison for more than 60 days 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.

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

WEB COPY

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 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, detention order in question cannot be sustained.”

WEB COPY

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 No.20/BCDFGISSSV/2025, dated 27.03.2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., A.Prince Prakash @ Rahis, aged about 25 years, S/o.Anurag Kumar Mishra, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless he is required in connection with any other case.

(M.S.RAMESH J.) (V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN J.)

04-07-2025

kas

Index: Yes / No

Neutral Citation

Speaking / Non Speaking

To

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

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Tambaram City.

M.S.RAMESH, J.
AND



V.LAKSHMINARAYAN



KaS

WEB COPY

3. The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
Cyber Crime Wing, Tambaram City.

4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

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

H.C.P NO. 713 of 2025

04.07.2025