



WEB COPY



HCP.No.903 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 24.06.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.903 of 2025

Anitha

Petitioner(s)/ sister in law of the detenue

Vs

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

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.

3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison Puzhal, Chennai
District.

4. The Inspector of Police,
D-3, Ice House Police Station,
Chennai District.

...Respondent(s)



HCP.No.903 of 2025


PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records connected with the detention order in No.112/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 25.02.2025 on the file of the Respondent No.2 and quash the same and direct the Respondents to produce the person of petitioner's brother in law one name Senthilkumar S/o.Mani, aged about 42 years, now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Muthamizhselvakumar
For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the sister in law of the detenu, Senthilkumar S/o.Mani, aged about 42 years, now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 25.02.2025 issued against her brother in law, 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



HCP.No.903 of 2025

[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 in that case, bail was granted by this Court considering the facts of the case, particularly that the offence was committed due to sudden provocation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet in Volume-II, this Court finds that the bail order relied upon by the Detaining Authority in CrI.O.P.No.30749 of 2024 dated 10.12.2024, is not similar to the case on hand, since the accused therein was granted bail by this Court considering the facts, particularly that the offence was committed due to sudden provocation. 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.

WEB COPY

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, 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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.903 of 2025

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.

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the



HCP.No.903 of 2025

second respondent on 25.02.2025 in No.112/BCDFGISSSV/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Senthilkumar S/o.Mani, aged about 42 years, now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, 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]
24.06.2025

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 (XVI)
Department, Secretariat, Chennai -
600 009.

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.

3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison Puzhal, Chennai
District.

4. The Inspector of Police,



HCP.No.903 of 2025

D-3, Ice House 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.903 of 2025

Anu

H.C.P.No.903 of 2025

24.06.2025