



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 25-09-2025

WEB COPY

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MRS JUSTICE J. NISHA BANU
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S. SOUNTHAR**

HCP No. 1404 of 2025

1. Thirumathi. Vadivukarasi
W/o. Paramasivam, No.30, Bagavathapuram
Tiruvidai Maruthur Taluka, Veppattur,
Tanjavur, Tamilnadu - 612105.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Additional Chief Secretary,
Government of TamilNadu, Home,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Office of the
Commissioner of Police, (Goondas
Section), Chennai, Tamilnadu - 600007
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai,
Tamil Nadu - 600066.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
R-8, Vadapalani Police Station,
Chennai. Tamil Nadu - 600026.

Respondent(s)



PRAYER: Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India to issue a Writ more particularly in the nature of writ of Habeas Corpus Calling for the records pertaining to the order of detention passed by the Second Respondent herein and made in BCDFGISSSV-No.291/2025 dated 30.05.2025, and to set aside the same and directing the third Respondent to produce the detainee, the petitioner's Son Manikandan, S/o. Paramasivam, Male aged about 25 years, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Hon'ble Court and thereby setting him at liberty.


For Petitioner(s): M/s.S.M.Raghuram

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein is the mother of detainee viz., Manikandan, S/o. Paramasivam, Male aged about 25 years, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai and she has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent, dated 30.05.2025, 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].



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 detenu are taking steps to take out the detenu on bail, suffers from non-application of mind, as the statement under 180 (3) of B.N.S.S, said to have been made by the detenu'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 detenu'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.

4. It is seen from the records that the statement obtained by the Sponsoring Authority from the relative of the detenu, enclosed in Page No.145 of Booklet, 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 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:-



WEB COPY



“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 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 dated 30.05.2025 in BCDFGISSSV No.291/2025 is hereby quashed and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenue, viz.,



Manikandan, s/o Paramasivam, Male aged about 25 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.)

25-09-2025

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

MST

To

1.The Additional Chief Secretary,
Government of TamilNadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise
Department, Secretariat,
Chennai - 600009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Office of the
Commissioner of Police, (Goondas
Section), Chennai, Tamilnadu - 600007

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai,
Tamil Nadu - 600066.

4.The Inspector of Police,
R-8, Vadapalani Police Station,
Chennai. Tamil Nadu - 600026.



WEB COPY

HCP No.1404 of 2



J.NISHA BANU J.
AND
S.SOUNTHAR J.

MST

HCP No. 1404 of 2025

25.09.2025