



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1086 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 10.07.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.1086 of 2025

Swetha

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. Government of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Additional Chief Secretary,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Avadi City, Chennai.

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

4. The Inspector of Police,
M5 - Ennore Police Station,
Chennai District.
Crime No.156 of 2025

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to



H.C.P.No.1086 of 2025

issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records detention order No.57/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 03.04.2025 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's brother namely Surendar @ Godown, aged about 28 years, S/o.Veerapandi, who is now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.


For Petitioner : Mr.S.Silambuselvan

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 sister of the detenu namely Surendar @ Godown, aged about 28 years, S/o.Veerapandi, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 03.04.2025 issued against her brother, 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.1086 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 possibility of the detenu coming out on bail, suffers from non-application of mind, as the statement under 180(iii) BNSS, is not dated. Hence, the learned counsel for the petitioner raised a *bona fide* doubt as to when this statement was obtained from the relatives of the detenu. The learned counsel further pointed out that, unless the statement relied upon by 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 statement, would vitiate the Detention Order.

4. It is seen from records that the statement made under 180(iii) of BNSS, obtained by the Sponsoring Authority, enclosed in the Booklet, is not dated. On a perusal of the Grounds of Detention, it is seen that, in Para No.4, the Detaining Authority has observed that the relatives of the




H.C.P.No.1086 of 2025

WEB COPY

detenu are taking action to take him out on bail by filing bail application and has arrived at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail. When the statement obtained by the Sponsoring Authority from the relatives of the detenu is not dated, the veracity of such statement becomes doubtful. The compelling necessity to detain the detenu would also depend on when the statement was obtained. In the absence of the date, the compelling necessity to detain, becomes suspicious. Hence, this Court is of the view that the subjective satisfaction of 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



H.C.P.No.1086 of 2025

WEB COPY

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.

11.In our opinion, the detention order in question only contains ipse dixit regarding the alleged imminent possibility of the accused coming



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1086 of 2025

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 on 03.04.2025 in No.57/BCDFGISSSV/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Surendar @ Godown, aged about 28 years, S/o.Veerapandi, 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.]

10.07.2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking order/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Sni



H.C.P.No.1086 of 2025

WEB COPY

- To
- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary
to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
 - 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Avadi City, Chennai.
 - 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison Puzhal,
Chennai District – 600 066.
 - 4.The Inspector of Police,
M5 - Ennore 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.1086 of 2025

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

Sni

H.C.P.No.1086 of 2025

10.07.2025