



H.C.P.No.953 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 06.08.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.953 of 2025

Nagarathnam

... Petitioner

Vs.

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


2.The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai
Vepery, Chennai 600 007

3.The Superintendent of Prison
Special Prison for Women
Puzhal, Chennai 600 066

4.The Inspector of Police
Alpha-6, Job Racket Investigation Wing
Central Crime Branch

... 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 records in connection with the order of detention passed by



H.C.P.No.953 of 2025

the second respondent dated 25.03.2025 in Memo No.174/BCDFGISSSV/2025 against the petitioner's daughter namely Hemalatha, female, aged 51 years, D/o.Thillainayagam, who is confined at Special Prison for Women, Puzhal, Chennai and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenue before this court and set her at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Senthilvel

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner, who is the mother of the detenue, viz. Hemalatha, aged about 51 years, D/o.Tillainayagam, confined at Special Prison for Women, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 25.03.2025 slapped on her daughter, branding her 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].



H.C.P.No.953 of 2025


2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the

WEB COPY

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 there was one previous case pending as 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 CrI.M.P.No.5181 of 2023 dated 11.12.2023 is not similar to the case on hand, since the accused therein was granted bail after recording the fact that there was one previous case reported against the accused therein. However, it is admitted that there are two adverse cases pending 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 paragraph Nos.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 the accused being released on bail, because it is



WEB COPY




H.C.P.No.953 of 2025

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. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent in No.174/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 25.03.2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenue viz.,



H.C.P.No.953 of 2025

Hemalatha, female, aged about 51 years, D/o.Thillainayagam, is directed

WEB COPY

to be set at liberty forthwith, unless her confinement is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R, J.]

[V.L.N, J.]

06.08.2025

kas

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

To

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

2.The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai
Vepery, Chennai 600 007

3.The Superintendent of Prison
Special Prison for Women
Puzhal, Chennai 600 066

4.The Inspector of Police
Alpha-6, Job Racket Investigation Wing
Central Crime Branch

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

M.S.RAMESH, J.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.953 of 2025

and
V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

kas

H.C.P.No.953 of 2025

06.08.2025