



WEB COPY

HCP No. 2416 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 03-06-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

HCP No. 2416 of 2024

1. Sowmya.H

D/o. K.Hariharan, Plot No.11-part, Sri
Velmurugan Nagar, 2nd Main Road,
Kolathur, Chennai - 600 099.

Petitioner

Vs

1. State Of Tamil Nadu

Rep.By Additional Chief Secretary,
Home Prohibition And Excise Wing,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.

2.Commissioner Of Police,
Greater Chennai Police, Vepery,
Chennai.

3.Superintendent Central Prison,
Puzhal-ii, Chennai.

4.Inspector Of Police,
Central Crime Branch, Edf-ii, Beta-5,
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.

Respondents



PRAYER : Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records of the 2nd respondent made in 688/ BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 19.06.2024 and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the person and body of the detenu Thiru.Hariharan, son of Krishnamoorthi, Hindu, aged about 58 yrs who is now confined Central Prison, Puzhal-II, before this Court, and set him at liberty.


For Petitioner : Mr.Prakash Goklaney

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

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by M.S.Ramesh J.)

The petitioner herein, who is the daughter of the detenu namely Hariharan, aged about 58 years, S/o.Krishnamoorthy, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 19.06.2024 issued against her father, 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. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned

Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

WEB COPY

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 petitioner/detenu are taking steps to take out the detenu on bail, suffers from non-application of mind, as the statement under 161 Cr.P.C., said to have been made by the detenu's relative before the Sponsoring Authority, is 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 relative. The learned counsel further pointed out that, unless the statement relied upon by the Sponsoring Authority is immediately before the Detaining Authority, 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 records that the statement obtained by the Sponsoring



WEB COPY

Authority from the detenu's relative, enclosed in the Booklet, stating that they are planning to file a bail application to bring out the detenu on bail, is not dated. On a perusal of the Grounds of Detention, it is seen that, in Para No.3, the Detaining Authority has observed that the Sponsoring Authority has stated that he came to know 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 statement 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 is not dated, the veracity of such statement becomes doubtful. The compelling necessity to detain the detenu would also depend on when the statement was 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

WEB COPY

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



WEB COPY



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. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 19.06.2024 in No.688/BCDFGISSSV/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Hariharan, aged about 58 years, S/o.Krishnamoorthy, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.



(M.S.RAMESH J.) (V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN J.)

03-06-2025

WEB COPY

nl

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

To

1.The Additional Chief Secretary,
Home Prohibition And Excise Wing,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.

2.Commissioner Of Police,
Greater Chennai Police, Vepery,
Chennai.

3.Superintendent Central Prison,
Puzhal-II, Chennai.

4.Inspector Of Police,
Central Crime Branch, EDF-II,
Beta-5, Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.



WEB COPY

HCP No. 2416 of 2



M.S.RAMESH J.
AND
V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN J.

nl



WEB COPY

HCP No. 2416 of 2



HCP No. 2416 of 2024

03-06-2025