



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1080 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 14.08.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.1080 of 2025

Rajeshwari

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.


2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tambaram City.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison Puzhal,
Chennai District.

4.The Inspector of Police,
T-3, Pallavaram Police Station,
Chennai District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records connected with the detention order in BCDFGISSSV No.31/2025 dated 11.04.2025



H.C.P.No.1080 of 2025

WEB COPY

on the file of the respondent No.2 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the person or petitioner's son namely V.Josuwa @ Jo, aged about 20 years, S/o.Vinoth, now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.


For Petitioner : Mr.P.Muthamizhselvakumar

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

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by *M.S. RAMESH, J.*)

The petitioner herein, who is the mother of the detenu namely V.Josuwa @ Jo, aged about 20 years, S/o.Vinoth, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 11.04.2025 issued against her son, branding him as "Goonda" 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].




H.C.P.No.1080 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 this petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner focused mainly on the ground that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority that there is a likelihood that the detenu may come out on bail, suffers from non-application of mind, as the Special Report of the Sponsoring Authority is not dated. Hence, the learned counsel raised a *bona fide* doubt as to the date on which the Special Report was sent by the Sponsoring Authority to the Detaining Authority. The learned counsel further pointed out that, unless the Special Report of the Sponsoring Authority is immediately before the Detaining Authority, it may not have relevance and hence, the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority based on this undated document, would vitiate the Detention Order.

4. On a perusal of the booklet, it is seen that the Special Report of the Sponsoring Authority is not dated. When the Special Report of the Sponsoring Authority is not dated, the veracity of the Report becomes



H.C.P.No.1080 of 2025

WEB COPY

doubtful. The compelling necessity to detain the detenu would also depend on when the Sponsoring Authority has sent the Report. Hence, this Court is of the view that the subjective satisfaction arrived at by the Detaining Authority based on such undated material, 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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1080 of 2025

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



H.C.P.No.1080 of 2025

order is liable to be quashed.

WEB COPY

7. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 11.04.2025 in BCDFGISSSV No.31/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., V.Josuwa @ Jo, aged about 20 years, S/o.Vinoth, 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.]

14.08.2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking order/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Sni



H.C.P.No.1080 of 2025

WEB COPY

To
1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tambaram City.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison Puzhal,
Chennai District.

4.The Inspector of Police,
T-3, Pallavaram Police Station,
Chennai District.

5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

6.The Joint Secretary, Public (Law & Order),
Chennai – 600 009.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1080 of 2025

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

Sni

H.C.P.No.1080 of 2025

14.08.2025