



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1428 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 07.08.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.1428 of 2025

NARAYANAN

Petitioner(s)/ father of the detenue

Vs

1. The state of Tamil Nadu rep by the
Additional Chief Secretary to
Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise
Department, Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai, Office of the
Commissioner of Police, Vepery,
Chennai -600007.

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

4.The Inspector of Police
J-3, Guindy Police Station, Chennai
District.

...Respondent(s)



HCP.No.1428 of 2025

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, to call of the records relating to the detention order in Memo BCDFGISSSV/181/2025, dated 04.04.2025 passed by the 2nd respondents and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's son namely N.Purushothaman, S/o. Narayanan, aged 25 years, presently detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Arun Kumar

For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

M.S.RAMESH, J.

and

V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

The petitioner herein, who is the father of the detenu, N.Purushothaman, S/o. Narayanan, aged 25 years, presently detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 04.04.2025 issued against his son, branding him as "Drug Offender" 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



HCP.No.1428 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 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 the contraband seized was intermediate quantity.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, this Court finds that the bail order relied upon by the Detaining Authority in CrI.O.P.No.18043 of 2024 dated 30.07.2024, is not similar to the case on hand, since the accused therein was granted bail after recording the fact that the contraband seized therein was intermediate quantity. However, it is admitted that the contraband seized from the detenu herein is commercial quantity. 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:-

“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,



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1428 of 2025

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



HCP.No.1428 of 2025

is liable to be quashed.

WEB COPY

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 04.04.2025 in Memo BCDFGISSSV/181/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., N.Purushothaman, S/o. Narayanan, aged 25 years, presently detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, 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]
07.08.2025

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

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to
Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise

Page 6 of 8



HCP.No.1428 of 2025

Department, Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.

WEB COPY

2.The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai, Office of the
Commissioner of Police, Vepery,
Chennai -600007.

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

4.The Inspector of Police
J-3, Guindy Police Station, Chennai
District.

5.The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai

6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.
Anu



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1428 of 2025

H.C.P.No.1428 of 2025

07.08.2025