



WEB COPY



HCP.No.900 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 09.07.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.900 of 2025

Santhi

Petitioner/Mother of Detenu

Vs

- 1.State of Tamil Nadu Rep by
The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.
 - 2.The Commissioner of Police,
The Greater Chennai City,
Vepery, Chennai – 600 007.
 - 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai District.
 - 4.The Inspector of Police,
J-3, Guindy Police Station,
Chennai.
- Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records relating to the detention order vide Memo No.180/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 04.04.2025, passed by the second respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1984 and



HCP.No.900 of 2025

set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's son Shanmugaraj s/o. Sekar aged about 34 years the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Mohan Raj

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, Shanmugaraj S/o. Sekar, aged about 34 years, now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 04.04.2025 issued against her son, branding him as "Drug Offender" 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].



HCP.No.900 of 2025

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned

Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

3. Though several grounds have been raised in the petition, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would mainly focus his arguments on the ground that the Detaining Authority has relied upon the order passed in CrI.O.P.No.18043 of 2024 dated 30.07.2024 and came to a conclusion that in a similar case, bail has been granted and that there is a likelihood of the detainee also to be released on bail. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the similar case relied upon by the Detaining Authority to arrive at the subjective satisfaction that the Detainee might be released on bail is not similar and therefore, there is a non-application of mind on the part of the Detaining Authority.

4. On a perusal of the Grounds of Detention and the booklet, it is seen that in the order that was relied upon by the Detaining Authority in CrI.O.P.No.18043 of 2024 dated 30.07.2024, the bail court had taken note of the fact that though the contraband seized was commercial quantity, intermediate quantity alone was seized from the petitioner therein and



therefore, had come to the *prima facie* conclusion that he is entitled to bail, which is not the fact in the case before the Detaining Authority. Hence, the similar case is not similar. It is in the said circumstances, this Court finds that the subjective satisfaction arrived at by the Detaining Authority suffers from non-application of mind. Hence, on the above ground, the Detention Order is liable to be quashed.

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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.900 of 2025

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.”

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



HCP.No.900 of 2025

order is liable to be quashed.

WEB COPY

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 04.04.2025 in BCDFGISSSV No.180/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detainee viz., Shanmugaraj s/o. Sekar, aged about 34 years, now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, 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]
09.07.2025
nl

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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.900 of 2025

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
The Greater Chennai City,
Vepery, Chennai – 600 007.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai District.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
J-3, Guindy Police Station,
Chennai.
- 5.The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.900 of 2025

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

H.C.P.No.900 of 2025



WEB COPY



HCP.No.900 of 2025

09.07.2025