



WEB COPY



HCP No.1325 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 25-10-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE N. SATHISH KUMAR
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN

HCP No.1325 of 2025

Renuka Parameswari
W/o.Jayagopal,
No.17/9, Sridevi Karumariamman Kovil Street,
Kodungaiyur, Chennai-600 118

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1.State of Tamil Nadu represented by
the Additional Chief Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.

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

3.The Inspector of Police,
P-6, Kodungaiyur Police Station,
Chennai.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison-II, Puzhal,
Chennai-600 066.



HCP No.1325 of 2025

Respondent(s)

WEB COPY

Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records relating to the detention order in Memo No.372/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 19.06.2025 passed by the second respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's son Charan @ Shyam, S/o.Jayagopi, aged about 24 years, the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.R.Muthukumar

For Respondent(s): Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(made by N.Sathish Kumar, J.)

The petitioner, who is the mother of the detenu Charan @ Shyam, S/o.Jayagopi, aged about 24 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 19.06.2025 bearing reference No.372/BCDFGISSSV/2025 slapped on her son, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Slum Grabbers and



HCP No.1325 of 2025

Video Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].

WEB COPY

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 petitioner in the habeas corpus petition assailing the detention order, in the hearing, learned counsel for the petitioner confined his argument only with regard to non-application of mind on the part of the detaining authority in arriving at the subjective satisfaction regarding imminent possibility of detenu being enlarged on bail while passing the impugned order of detention.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the detenu was arrested and remanded to judicial custody in connection with the ground case and three adverse cases. The detenu has not moved any bail application in respect of those cases and therefore, there is no real possibility of the detenu coming out on bail in the near future. However, the detaining authority while passing the impugned detention order arrived at the subjective satisfaction regarding imminent possibility of coming out on bail by relying on a bail order in Crl.M.P.No.26094 of 2024.



WEB COPY

5. In this regard, the learned counsel drew the attention this Court to the order in CrI.M.P.No.26094 of 2024, which is enclosed at Page No.80 of Volume II of the booklet. A perusal of the said order shows that there is one previous case pending against the petitioners therein, whereas, there are three previous cases pending against the detenu herein and therefore, the subjective satisfaction arrived at by the detaining authority regarding the imminent possibility of detenu being enlarged on bail shows clear non-application of mind. Therefore, the impugned preventive detention order deserves to be dislodged.

6. *Per contra*, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor while reiterating the averments in the counter affidavit submits that the order of detention has been passed on cogent and sufficient materials and the same cannot be interfered with at the instance of the petitioner.

7. Considering the submissions made by both sides, this court is of the considered view that there is non application of mind on the part of the detaining authority while passing the impugned order. In such view of the matter, the impugned detention order is liable to be quashed.



HCP No.1325 of 2025

In the result, this Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the detention

order passed by the second respondent dated 19.06.2025 in No.372/BCDFGISSSV/2025 is hereby set aside. The detenu Charan @ Shyam, S/o.Jayagopi, aged about 24 years, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless he is required in connection with any other case.

(N.S.K., J.) (M.J.R., J.)

25-10-2025

nsd

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes; Neutral Citation: Yes/No

To

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.

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

4.The Inspector of Police,
Law and Order, D-1, Triplicane Police Station,
Chennai.

5.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court, Chennai.

6.The Joint Secretary to Government,



HCP No.1325 of 2025

Public (Law and Order), Fort St.George, Chennai – 9.

WEB COPY

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.
and
M.JOTHIRAMAN, J.

nsd

HCP No.1325 of 2025

25.10.2025