



H.C.P.No.880 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 30.06.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.880 of 2025

Prasanth

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu Rep. by its
Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-09.

2.The Commissioner of Police / Detaining Authority
Tiruppur City.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison
Coimbatore

4.The Inspector of Police
Anupparpalayam Police Station
Tiruppur City

... Respondents

Prayer: Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the entire records pertaining to the detention order passed by



H.C.P.No.880 of 2025

the 2nd respondent in C.No.08/G/IS/Tiruppur City/2025 dated 05.03.2025 and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's brother namely Karuppaiah, S/o.Kailasam, aged about 23 years, who is now confined in Central Prison, Coimbatore, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Vivekanandan

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein is the brother of the detenu viz., Karuppaiah, aged 23 years, S/o.Kailasam, confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 05.03.2025 slapped on him, branding his brother as "Goonda" 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 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 only by referring to Covid-19 pandemic. Apart from that there are two adverse cases as against the petitioner herein.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, this Court finds that the bail order passed in the case relied upon by the Detaining Authority, in Cr.M.P.No.810 of 2021, dated 20.05.2021, is not similar to the case on hand, since the accused therein was released on bail mainly by citing Covid-19. This apart, the petitioner herein has got two adverse cases. Therefore, this Court finds that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority is irrational and the detention order is liable to quashed on the ground of non-application of mind.



H.C.P.No.880 of 2025

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. In the instant case, the Detaining Authority has arrived at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail by referring to a bail order granted to the accused in a similar case, wherein, the said bail was granted mainly by citing Covid-19 Pandemic. Therefore, the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority that the detenu is likely to be released on bail suffers from non-application of mind. 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 No.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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.880 of 2025

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."

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.



H.C.P.No.880 of 2025

WEB COPY

7. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent, in C.No.08/G/IS/Tiruppur City/2025, dated 05.03.2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenue viz., Karuppaiah, Male, aged 23 years, S/o.Kailasam, who is 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.R, J.]

[V.L.N, J.]

30.06.2025

kas

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

To


1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-09.

2.The Commissioner of Police / Detaining Authority
Tiruppur City.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison
Coimbatore

4.The Inspector of Police

Page 6 of 8



H.C.P.No.880 of 2025

Anupparpalayam Police Station
Tiruppur City

WEB COPY

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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.880 of 2025

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

kas

H.C.P.No.880 of 2025

30.06.2025