



H.C.P.No.1108 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 19-09-2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE J. NISHA BANU

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. SOUNTHAR

H.C.P.No.1108 of 2025

Y.Nathiya

W/o Yovaraj

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Chennai-600 007.

3. The Inspector of Police,
P3 Vyasarpadi Police Station,

4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai.

... Respondents

PRAYER: The Habeas Corpus Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records relating to the detention order dated 20.05.2025 passed by the second respondent in his proceedings No.266/BCDFGISSSV/2025 and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's nephew namely Ajaykumar @ Tom, Son of Pavulraj, aged



H.C.P.No.1108 of 2025

about 26 years, who is presently undergoing detention in the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Vinoth

For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

J.Nisha Banu,J.
and
S.Sounthar,J

The petitioner is the aunt of the detenue, viz., Ajaykumar @ Tom, Son of Pavulraj, aged 26 years, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent in No.266/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 20.05.2025, 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] read with the order issued by the Government in G.O.(D).No.97, Home Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department dated 11.04.2025 under sub section 2 of section 3 of the said Act.



H.C.P.No.1108 of 2025

WEB COPY 2. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents. We have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.

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 the relatives of the detainee are taking steps to take out the detainee on bail, suffers from non-application of mind, as the statement under 180 (iii) of B.N.S.S, said to have been made by the detainee's relatives before the Sponsoring Authority, are not dated. Hence, the learned counsel for the petitioner raised a *bona fide* doubt as to when this statement was obtained from the detainee's relatives. The learned counsel further pointed out that, unless the statements relied upon by the Sponsoring Authority is immediately before the Detention Order, it may not have relevance and hence, the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority based on this undated statement, would vitiate the Detention Order.




H.C.P.No.1108 of 2025

WEB COPY

4. It is seen from records that the statement obtained by the Sponsoring Authority from the detenu's relatives, enclosed in Vol.I, Page No.255 of the booklet, Section 180(iii) statement stating that they are planning to file a bail application to bring out the detenu on bail, are not dated. On a perusal of the Grounds of Detention, it is seen that the Detaining Authority has observed that the Sponsoring Authority has stated that he came to understand that the relatives of the detenu are taking steps to take him out on bail by filing bail application before the appropriate Court and has arrived at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is likely to be released on bail. When the statements obtained by the Sponsoring Authority from the relatives of the detenu stating that they are planning to file bail application to bring out the detenu on bail, are not dated, the veracity of such statements becomes doubtful. The compelling necessity to detain the detenu would also depend on when the statements were obtained. In the absence of the date, the compelling necessity to detain, becomes suspect. 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*



H.C.P.No.1108 of 2025

Tamil Nadu through Secretary to Government and another' reported in **WEB CO'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 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.1108 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. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 20.05.2025 in No.266/BCDFGISSSV/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Ajaykumar @ Tom, S/o.Pavulraj, aged about 26 years, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case.

(J.NISHA BANU J.) (S.SOUNTHAR J.)
19.09.2025

vsi
To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.




H.C.P.No.1108 of 2025

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Chennai-600 007.

3. The Inspector of Police,
P3 Vyasarpadi Police Station,

4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai.

5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Chennai



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1108 of 2025

J. NISHA BANU, J.
and
S. SOUNTHAR, J.

vsi

H.C.P.No.1108 of 2025

19-09-2025