



H.C.P.No.1033 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 29.08.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.1033 of 2025

Nandhini @ Yuvarani

... Petitioner

Vs.

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

2.The District Magistrate and District Collector
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector
Namakkal District

3.The Superintendent of Police
Office of the Superintendent of Police
Namakkal District

4.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison at Salem
Hasthampatty
Salem-7

5.The Inspector of Police
Tiruchengode Rural Police Station
Namakkal

... Respondents



H.C.P.No.1033 of 2025

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 detention order in No.C.M.P.No.38/GOONDA/2025/ (M1) dated 29.04.2025 on the file of the 2nd respondent and set aside the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's husband / detenu viz.Suruttaiyan @ Prabhakaran, S/o.Angamuthu, aged 43 years, now confined in Central Prison at Salem, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Mohamed Saifulla

For Respondents : Mr.A.Damodaran
Additional Public Prosecutor
Assisted by M.Arifa Thasneem
Advocate

ORDER

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

The petitioner, who is the wife of the detenu viz., Suruttaiyan @ Prabhakaran, Male, aged about 43 years, S/o.Angamuthu, confined at Central prison, Salem, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 29.04.2025 slapped on her husband, branding him as "GOONDA" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand



H.C.P.No.1033 of 2025

Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act

14 of 1982].

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 (ii) 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 C.M.P.No.548 of 2023, bail was granted to the accused therein. On a perusal of the said order, in page No.4 of the Booklet in Volume II, this Court finds that the said order relates to release of the accused on bail u/s.167[2] of Cr.P.C. and the bail was granted to the accused therein



H.C.P.No.1033 of 2025

since he had been in prison for more than 108 days and not on merits.

Therefore, it is not a similar case and the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority, regarding the possibility of the detenu coming out 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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1033 of 2025

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 order is liable to be quashed.



H.C.P.No.1033 of 2025

7. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second

respondent, in C.M.P.No.38/GOONDA/2025/(M1), dated 29.04.2025, is

hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu

viz. Suruttaiyan @ Prabhakaran, aged about 43 years, S/o.Angamuthu,

confined at Central Prison, Salem, 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.]

29.08.2025

kas

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking

Neutral Citation

To

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

2.The District Magistrate and District Collector
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector
Namakkal District

3.The Superintendent of Police
Office of the Superintendent of Police
Namakkal District



H.C.P.No.1033 of 2025

4.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison at Salem
Hasthampatty
Salem-7

5.The Inspector of Police
Tiruchengode Rural Police Station
Namakkal

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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1033 of 2025

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

kas

H.C.P.No.1033 of 2025

29.08.2025