



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1447 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. 1447 of 2025

Venda
W/o. Mahendiran,
No.214, Ramar Kovil Street,
V.Mottur Village, Veerichettipalli Post,
Gudiyatham Taluk, Vellore District.

Petitioner

Vs


1. The Secretary to Government,
Government of Tamilnadu (Home)
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai.

2.The District Collector and District
Magistrate,
Vellore District , Vellore - 9.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Vellore District, Vellore.

4.The Superintendent
Central Prison, Salem , Salem
District.

5.The Inspector of Police,



HCP.No.1447 of 2025

K.V.Kuppam Police Station,
K.V.Kuppam, Vellore District.

WEB COPY

Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the impugned order C3/D.O.No.14/2025 dated 21.03.2025 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein and set aside the same as illegal and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's husband namely Mahendiran Son of Arumugam, aged about 29 years, now Confined at Central Prison, Salem before this Court set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Vinodhkumar

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, Mahendiran, son of Arumugam, aged about 29 years, confined at Central Prison, Salem, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 21.03.2025 issued against her husband, branding him as "Drug Offender" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of



HCP.No.1447 of 2025

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. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

3. Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner pointed out that the Detaining Authority has not applied its mind while expressing its subjective satisfaction that the detenu is also likely to be released on bail. It is his submission that the case relied upon by the Detaining Authority is not similar to the present case, as the bail was granted in favour of the accused therein by recording the fact that there was no previous case as against the accused therein.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, this Court finds that the bail order relied upon by the Detaining Authority in Crl.M.P.No.565 of 2023 dated 06.06.2023, is not similar to the case on hand, since the accused therein was



HCP.No.1447 of 2025

granted bail after recording the fact that no previous case was reported against the accused therein. However, it is admitted that there are 3 adverse cases as against the detenu herein. Considering the nature of the bail order in the similar case relied upon by the Detaining Authority and the case on hand, this Court finds that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority that the detenu is also likely to be released on bail, 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 paragraphs 10 and 11 of the said judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court:-



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1447 of 2025

“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.”



HCP.No.1447 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 21.03.2025 in C3/D.O./14/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Mahendiran, son of Arumugam, aged about 29 years, confined at Central Prison, Salem, 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

Page 6 of 8



HCP.No.1447 of 2025

1. The Secretary to Government,
Government of Tamilnadu (Home)
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai.

2. The District Collector and District
Magistrate,
Vellore District , Vellore - 9.

3. The Superintendent of Police,
Vellore District, Vellore.

4. The Superintendent
Central Prison, Salem , Salem
District.

5. The Inspector of Police,
K.V.Kuppam Police Station,
K.V.Kuppam, Vellore District.

6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1447 of 2025

V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

vum

H.C.P.No.1447 of 2025

13.08.2025