



H.C.P.No.1001 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 22.07.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.1001 of 2025

Ammu

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by its 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
Central Prison
Puzhal, Chennai

4.The Inspector of Police
J-4, Kotturpuram Police Station
Chennai

... Respondents

Prayer: Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of Writ of Habeas Corpus,



H.C.P.No.1001 of 2025

to call for the records in No.198/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 17.04.2025, on the file of second respondent herein and set aside the same as illegal and produce the detenu viz. Manoj @ Karan @ B4, Son of Vajravelu, aged about 21 years, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.Ilayaraja Kandasamy

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 detenu, viz. Manoj @ Karan @ B4, aged about 21 years, S/o.Vajravelu, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 17.04.2025 slapped on her son, branding him 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.1001 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 by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the detention order is liable to be quashed on the sole ground that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority regarding the possibility of the detenu coming out on bail by relying upon the bail order granted to the accused in a similar case, suffers from non-application of mind.

4. On a perusal, it is seen that in paragraph 4 of the Grounds of Detention, the Detaining Authority has stated that there is a possibility of the detenu coming out on bail in the ground case since in a similar case i.e. in CrI.O.P.No.30749 of 2024, bail was granted to the accused therein on 10.12.2024. On a perusal of the said order, in page Nos.24 to 27 of the Booklet in Volume II, this Court finds that the accused therein was granted bail considering the fact that the murder was committed under sudden provocation, whereas in the present case, it is a planned murder. Therefore, it is not a similar case and the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority, regarding the possibility of the detenu coming out



H.C.P.No.1001 of 2025

on bail suffers from non-application of mind, which vitiates the detention order. Hence, on this 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 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.1001 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.198/BCDFGISSSV/2025, dated 17.04.2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz.



H.C.P.No.1001 of 2025

Manoj @ Karan @ B4, aged about 21 years, S/o.Vajravelu, confined at

Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, 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.]

22.07.2025

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
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai

4.The Inspector of Police
J-4, Kotturpuram Police Station
Chennai

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

Page 6 of 7



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1001 of 2025

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

kas

H.C.P.No.1001 of 2025

22.07.2025