



H.C.P.No.812 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 02.07.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.812 of 2025

Selvaraj

... Petitioner

Vs.

State rep. by

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, Government of Tamil Nadu,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.


2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison – II,
Puzhal, Chennai.

4.The Inspector of Police (L&O),
F-1, Chinthadripet Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to
issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records pertaining to the order



H.C.P.No.812 of 2025

of detention dated 19.02.2025 passed by the 2nd respondent in No.103/BCDFGISSSV/2025 and quash the same as illegal and direct the respondents to produce the detenu namely Manikandan, aged about 24 years, S/o.Selvaraj, now confined at Central Prison - II, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Senthilkumar

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

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by M.S. RAMESH, J.)

The petitioner herein, who is the father of the detenu namely Manikandan, aged about 24 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 19.02.2025 issued against his son, 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].



H.C.P.No.812 of 2025

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 there is a possibility of the detenu coming out on bail, suffers from non-application of mind, as the statement under 180(iii) BNSS, is not dated. Hence, the learned counsel for the petitioner raised a *bona fide* doubt as to when this statement was obtained. The learned counsel further pointed out that, unless the statement relied upon by the Sponsoring Authority is immediately before the Detaining Authority, it may not have relevance and hence, the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority based on this undated statement, would vitiate the Detention Order.

4. It is seen from records that the statement made under 180(iii) of BNSS, obtained by the Sponsoring Authority, enclosed in the Booklet, is not dated. On a perusal of the Grounds of Detention, it is seen that, in Para No.4, the Detaining Authority has observed that the relatives of the detenu are



H.C.P.No.812 of 2025

taking steps to take him out on bail by filing bail application and has arrived at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail.

When the statement obtained by the Sponsoring Authority from the mother of the detenu is not dated, the veracity of such statement becomes doubtful.

The compelling necessity to detain the detenu would also depend on when the statement was 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:-

WEB COPY

“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, the detention order in question cannot be sustained.”



H.C.P.No.812 of 2025

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 on 19.02.2025 in No.103/BCDFGISSSV/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Manikandan, aged about 24 years, S/o.Selvaraj, 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.]


02.07.2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking order/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Sni



H.C.P.No.812 of 2025

To
WEB COPY

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, Government of Tamil Nadu,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison – II,
Puzhal, Chennai.

4.The Inspector of Police (L&O),
F-1, Chinthadripet Police Station,
Chennai.

5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

6.The Joint Secretary, Public (Law & Order),
Chennai – 600 009.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.812 of 2025

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

Sni

H.C.P.No.812 of 2025

02.07.2025