



WEB COPY

HCP No. 1416 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 23-09-2025

CORAM

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

H.C.P No. 1416 of 2025

1. Lakshmi

W/o.Ranganathan, Velu Nagar, 5th
Cross Street, Erikarai Road,
Peerankaranai, Chennai - 600 063.


Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State of Tamil Nadu Rep. by its
Secretary to Government, Home,
Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.

2.The Commissioner of Police
Tambaram City, Chennai - 600 119.

3.The Inspector of Police
(Law and Order)
T-21, Kilambakkam Police Station,
Tambaram City.



4. The Superintendent
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

WEB COPY

Respondent(s)

PRAAYER

The Habeas Corpus Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records of the detention made in Memo No.59/B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V./2025 dated 26.05.2025 passed by the Commissioner of Police, Tambaram City, Chennai - 119, the second respondent herein and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Court and set the detenu R.Muthu, S/o.Ranganathan, aged 23 years now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal II, Chennai and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.R.Balakrishnan

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

ORDER

J. NISHA BANU, J.

and

S. SOUNTHAR, J.

The petitioner herein, who is the mother of the detenu namely, R.Muthu, aged 23 years, S/o.Ranganathan, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 26.05.2025 slapped on her son, 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].



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 the relatives of the detenu are taking steps to take out the detenu on bail, suffers from non-application of mind, as the Special Report of the Sponsoring Authority is not dated. Hence, the learned counsel raised a *bona fide* doubt as to the date on which the Special Report was sent by the Sponsoring Authority to the Detaining Authority. The learned counsel further pointed out that, unless the Special Report of 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 these undated documents, would vitiate the Detention Order.

4. It is seen from the records that in Page Nos.265 and 267 of the Booklet, the Special Report of the Sponsoring Authority is not dated. When the Special Report of the Sponsoring Authority is not dated, the veracity of the Report becomes doubtful. The compelling necessity to detain the detenu would also depend on when the Sponsoring Authority has sent his Report. Hence, this Court is of the view that the subjective satisfaction arrived at by the Detaining



Authority based on such undated materials, suffers from non-application of mind.

WEB COPY

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:-

“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

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. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 26.05.2025 in BCDFGISSSV No.59/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., **R.Muthu**, aged 23 years, **S/o.Ranganathan**, 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.)

23-09-2025

ASI



WEB COPY

- To
1. The Secretary to Government, Home,
Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.
 2. The Commissioner of Police
Tambaram City, Chennai - 600 119.
 3. The Inspector of Police
(Law and Order)
T-21, Kilambakkam Police Station,
Tambaram City.
 4. The Superintendent
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.
 5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras, Chennai.



WEB COPY

HCP No. 1416 of 2025



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

ASI

H.C.P No. 1416 of 2025

23-09-2025