



HCP No.1472 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 28.10.2025

CORAM

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

HCP No.1472 of 2025

Vijaya
W/o.Honestraj,
No.1, Chrompet, CS Lane, 5th Cross Street,
Chennai-600044.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai District.

4.The Inspector of Police
H-1, Washermenpet Police Station, Chennai.

Respondent(s)



HCP No.1472 of 2025

Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records pertaining to the order of detention passed by the second respondent in his proceedings in No.420/BCDFGISSSV/2025, dated 28.06.2025 and quash the same as illegal and produce the detenu, viz. Honestraj, S/o.Munivel, aged 34 years, as GOONDA now he is confined in Central Prison, Puzhal II, Chennai before this Court.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.C.Raja

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

ORDER

(made by N.Sathish Kumar, J.)

The petitioner, who is the wife of the detenu Honestraj, S/o.Munivel, aged 34 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 28.06.2025 bearing No.420/BCDFGISSSV/2025 slapped on her husband, 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 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.

WEB COPY

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 two adverse cases. The detenu has moved a bail application in respect of the ground case and adverse cases and the same were allowed, but, since the detenu was unable to furnish sufficient sureties, he is still in prison. At present, no bail application is pending against the detenu 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.602 of 2025.

WEB COPY

5. In this regard, the learned counsel drew the attention this Court to the order in Crl.M.P.No.602 of 2025, which is enclosed at Page No.76 in Volume II of the booklet. A perusal of the said order shows that there is no previous case pending against the petitioner therein, whereas, there are two 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



HCP No.1472 of 2025

detaining authority while passing the impugned order. In such view of the matter, the impugned detention order is liable to be quashed.

In the result, this Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 28.06.2025 in No.420/BCDFGISSSV/2025 is hereby set aside. The detenu Honestraj, S/o.Munivel, aged 34 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.)
28.10.2025

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

To



HCP No.1472 of 2025

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai.

3.The Superintendent Of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai District.

4.The Inspector of Police
H-1, Washermenpet Police Station, Chennai.

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

6.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and Order),
Fort St.George, Chennai – 9.

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.
and



WEB COPY



HCP No.1472 of 2025

M.JOTHIRAMAN, J.

nsd

HCP No.1472 of 2025

28.10.2025