



H.C.P.No.966 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.966 of 2025

Gomathi

... Petitioner


Vs.

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department
Fort St. George
Chennai 600 009

2.The District Magistrate & District Collector
Namakkal
Namakkal District

3.The Superintendent of Police
Namakkal
Namakkal District

4.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison - Salem
Salem District



H.C.P.No.966 of 2025

5.State rep. by its
The Inspector of Police
All Women Police Station
Rasipuram
Namakkal District

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the entire records, relating to the petitioner's husband detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order dated 08.03.2025 on the file of the second respondent herein made in proceedings Memo C.M.P.No.19/Sexual Offender/2025 [M1], quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's husband namely Yuvaraj, S/o.Muthusamy, aged 30 years, before this Court and set the petitioner's husband at liberty from detention, now the petitioner's husband detained at Central Prison, Salem.

For petitioner : Mr.W.Camyles Gandhi

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the wife of the detenu viz. Yuvaraj, aged about 30 years, S/o.Muthusamy, has come forward with this petition



H.C.P.No.966 of 2025

challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 08.03.2025 slapped on her husband, branding him as "Sexual 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].

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

3. Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the subjective satisfaction of the detaining authority that the detenu is likely to come out on bail suffers from non application of mind, as the similar case relied upon by the detaining authority is not similar.

4. It is seen from the grounds of detention that the detaining authority has relied upon a bail order passed by the learned Sessions Judge, Magalir



H.C.P.No.966 of 2025

Neethi Mandram (Fast Track Mahila Court), Namakkal, in CrI.M.P.No.176

WEB COPY

of 2024, in Crime No.18 of 2024, for an accused in the said case. On a perusal of the said order, we find that the said case cannot be said to be similar since the accused therein was released on bail for the offence committed U/s.137(ii) BNS & 5(l). 5(j)(ii) r/w 6(l) of POCSO Act, 2012, whereas in the present case, the detenu was remanded to judicial custody in connection with the Crime No.04/2025 U/s.87 BNS & 5(l), 5(j)(ii) r/w 6 of POCSO Act, 2012. Therefore, the said case cannot be said to be similar. Hence, the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority regarding the possibility of the detenu is likely to come out 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



H.C.P.No.966 of 2025

satisfaction was irrational or there was non-application of mind, the Hon'ble

WEB COPY

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 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.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.966 of 2025

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 C.M.P.No.19/Sexual Offender/2025/[M1] dated 08.03.2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Yuvaraj, Male, aged about 30 years, S/o.Muthusamy, presently detained at Central Prison, Salem, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R, J.] [V.L.N, J.]
30.06.2025

kas

Index: Yes/No Neutral Citation: Yes/No



H.C.P.No.966 of 2025

To

WEB COPY

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department
Fort St. George
Chennai 600 009

2.The District Magistrate & District Collector
Namakkal
Namakkal District

3.The Superintendent of Police
Namakkal
Namakkal District

4.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison - Salem
Salem District

5.The Inspector of Police
All Women Police Station
Rasipuram
Namakkal District

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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.966 of 2025

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

kas

H.C.P.No.966 of 2025

30.06.2025