



WEB COPY



HCP.No.866 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 08.07.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.866 of 2025

Manimegalai

Petitioner(s)/ mother of the detenue

Vs

1. The State of Tamilnadu, Rep By Its
Secretary,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St George, Chennai-600 009

2. The District Magistrate and District
Collector,
Office of the District Collector,
Namakkal District.

3. The Superintendent of Police
Office of the Superintendent of
Police, Namakkal District.

4. The Superintendent
Central Prison, Salem

5. The Inspector of Police
Namakkal Police Station, Namakkal
District.

...Respondent(s)



HCP.No.866 of 2025

WEB COPY


PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records of the detention order in C.M.P.No.29/Goonda/2025/M1 Dated 30.03.2025 on the file of the Second respondent Herein and Quash the Same and direct the Respondents herein to produce the body or in Person of the Detenu Sanjay, S/o.Selvaraju, aged 21 years, confined at Central Prison, Salem before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Dhasarathan
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, Sanjay, S/o.Selvaraju, aged 21 years, confined at Central Prison, Salem, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 30.03.2025 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, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Sexual Offenders,



HCP.No.866 of 2025

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 the no previous cases were pending 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 Cr.M.P.No.1144 of 2024 dated 04.10.2024, is not similar to the case on hand, since the accused therein was granted bail after recording the fact that there was no previous case reported against the accused therein. However, it is admitted that there is one adverse case 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,



WEB COPY



HCP.No.866 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.



HCP.No.866 of 2025

WEB COPY

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 30.03.2025 in C.M.P.No.29/Goonda/2025/M1, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Sanjay, S/o.Selvaraju, aged 21 years, confined at Central Prison, Salem, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R., J] [V.L.N., J]
08.07.2025

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Internet: Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
Anu

To

1. The State of Tamilnadu, Rep By Its
Secretary,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St George, Chennai-600 009

2.The District Magistrate and District
Collector,
Office of the District Collector,
Namakkal District.

3.The Superintendent of Police
Office of the Superintendent of
Police, Namakkal District.



HCP.No.866 of 2025

WEB COPY

4.The Superintendent
Central Prison, Salem

5.The Inspector of Police
Namakkal Police Station, Namakkal
District.

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

7.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.866 of 2025

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

H.C.P.No.866 of 2025

08.07.2025