



WEB COPY



HCP.No.705 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 03.07.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.705 of 2025

Vani

Petitioner(s) /mother of the detainee

Vs

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

2. The Commissioner of police
Avadi City, Officer of the
Commissioner of police, (Goondas
section), Avadi, Chennai - 600054.

3. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai - 600008.

4. The Inspector of Police (L and O)
T-1, Ambattur Police Station, Chennai
District.

Respondent(s)

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



HCP.No.705 of 2025

issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records relating to the detention order dated 24-03-2025 passed by the second respondent in No.52/BCDFGISSSV/2025 and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's Son Sujith kumar, son of Paramasivam, aged 21 years, No.14, Kullan Street, Mangalapuram, Ambattur Estate, Chennai - 600 098, who is presently under going detention in the Central Prison, Puzhal, branding him as Goonda under Section 3(1) of the Tamil Nadu prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest offenders, Goondas, immoral Traffic Offenders, Slum Grabbers and video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamilnadu Act 14 of 1982) before this Honble Court.

For Petitioner	: Mr.V.Sukumar
For Respondents	: Mr.E.Raj Thilak Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

M.S.RAMESH, J.

and

V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

The petitioner herein, who is the mother of the detenu, Sujith kumar, son of Paramasivam, aged 21 years, detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 24.03.2025 issued against her son, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders,




HCP.No.705 of 2025

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, 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 detenu'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.



HCP.No.705 of 2025

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 suspicious. 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.

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 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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.705 of 2025

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 24.03.2025 in No.52/BCDFGIISSSV/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Sujith kumar, son of Paramasivam, aged 21 years, detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case.



HCP.No.705 of 2025

[M.S.R., J]

[V.L.N., J]

03.07.2025

WEB COPY

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Anu

To

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

2. The Commissioner of police
Avadi City, Officer of the
Commissioner of police, (Goondas
section), Avadi, Chennai - 600054.

3. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai - 600008.

4. The Inspector of Police (L and O)
T-1, Ambattur Police Station, Chennai
District.

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

6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

M.S.RAMESH, J.

and

V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.705 of 2025

H.C.P.No.705 of 2025

03.07.2025