



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1145 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 13-08-2025

CORAM

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

HCP No. 1145 of 2025

Dhanalakshmi
w/o.Manimaran,
No.118, Ayyasamy Pillai Street,
Pumping Station,
Pudhupet, Chennai - 600 002.

Petitioner

Vs

1. The State of Tamilnadu
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-9.

2.The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai, Chennai.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison-I, Puzhal, Chennai-66.

4.The Inspector of Police,
F2 Egmore Police Station, Chennai.

Respondents

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



HCP.No.1145 of 2025

issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the entire records leading to the detention of the petitioner's husband Manimaran son of Prabhu, male aged about 30 years is presently lodged in Central Prison, Puzhal at Chennai and has been detained under Act 14/82 as a “drug offender” vide detention order dated 24.04.2025 made in memo No.227/BCDFGISSSV/2025 by the Commissioner of Police, Greater Chennai the 2nd respondent herein and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the body and person of the said detenu before this Court and thereafter set him at liberty from the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Rajavelu

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

ORDER

M.S.RAMESH, J.

and

V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

The petitioner herein, who is the wife of the detenu, Manimaran, Male aged 30 years, S/o. Prabhu, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 24.04.2025 issued against her husband, branding him as "Drug Offender" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders,



HCP.No.1145 of 2025

Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Sexual 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 3 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 Cr.M.P.No.5272 of 2023, dated 24.07.2023, bail was granted to the accused therein. On a perusal of the said order, in page No.66 of the Booklet, 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 since he had been in prison for 63 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 paragraphs 10 and 11 of the said judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court:-

“10.In our opinion, if details are given by the



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1145 of 2025

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 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



HCP.No.1145 of 2025

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 24.04.2025 in No.227/BCDFGISSSV/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Manimaran, Male aged 30 years, S/o. Prabhu, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, 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]
13.08.2025

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Internet: Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
vum

To

1. The State of Tamilnadu
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-9.

2.The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai, Chennai.



HCP.No.1145 of 2025

3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison-I, Puzhal, Chennai-66.

4. The Inspector of Police,
F2 Egmore Police Station, Chennai.

5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

M.S.RAMESH, J.

and

V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1145 of 2025

vum

H.C.P.No. 1145 of 2025

13.08.2025