



H.C.P.No.1674 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 24.09.2025

C O R A M

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE J.NISHA BANU

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

H.C.P.No.1674 of 2025

M.Sathish Kannan

... Petitioner/Brother of the detenue

-VS-

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai-600 007.
3. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai-600 066.
4. The Inspector of Police (L&O),
R-3, Ashok Nagar Police Station,
Ashok Nagar, Chennai-10.

... Respondents

Prayer: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records connected with the detention order passed by the second respondent in BCDFGISSSV No.189/2025 dated 12.04.2025 and quash the same as illegal and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of petitioner brother namely



H.C.P.No.1674 of 2025

Mr.Nandhu @ Raj kumar Male aged 32 years Son of Mr. Mohan residing at No.21-B 7th Street Pudhur Ashok Nagar Chennai-83 now confined at Central Prison Puzhal Chennai before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith and pass such further or other orders as this Honble Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Kannan
For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan
Addl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the brother of the detenue, namely, Nandhu @ Raj kumar, S/o.Mohan, Male, aged 32 years, detained at Central Prison, Puzal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order dated 12.04.2025, passed by the second respondent in BCDFGISSSV No.189/2025, branding him as a "Drug Offender", as contemplated under Section 2 (e) of 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 and the learned



H.C.P.No.1674 of 2025

Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

WEB COPY

3. Though learned counsel for the petitioner has raised several other grounds to assail the order of detention, he has mainly focused his argument on the ground that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority regarding the possibility of the detainee coming out on bail, by relying upon the bail order dated 04.06.2021, granted to the accused in a similar case in CrI.M.P.No.1414 of 2021, suffers from non-application of mind.

4. In paragraph No.4 of the Grounds of Detention, the Detaining Authority has stated that there is a possibility of the detainee coming out on bail in the ground case, since, in a similar case, bail was granted to the accused therein and relied upon an order passed by the Principal Special Judge for EC and NDPS Act, Chennai in Crime No.134 of 2021 on the file of E-4, Abiramapuram Police Station. On a perusal of the said order in Page No.53 of the Booklet (Vol.II), this Court finds that the bail was granted to the accused therein on the ground that there was no



H.C.P.No.1674 of 2025

previous against the said accused, whereas it is stated that the detenue herein

has two previous cases and therefore, the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority, regarding the possibility of the detenue coming out on bail suffers from non-application of mind, which vitiates the detention order.

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. In the instant case, the Detaining Authority has arrived at the subjective satisfaction that the detenue is likely to be released on bail by referring to a bail order granted to an accused in a similar case in Cr.M.P.No.1358 of 2023. However, the said bail was granted on the ground that the investigation has been completed and not on merits and therefore, the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority that the detenue is likely to be released on bail suffers from non-application of mind. Hence, on the above grounds, the Detention Order is liable to be quashed. It is relevant to extract paragraph Nos.10 and 11 of the



H.C.P.No.1674 of 2025

said judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court:-

WEB COPY

“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.”

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



H.C.P.No.1674 of 2025


order is liable to be quashed.

WEB COPY

7. For the aforesaid reasons, this Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the Detention Order passed by the **SECOND RESPONDENT** in **BCDFGISSSV NO.189/2025** dated **12.04.2025**, is hereby set aside. The detainee, viz., **NANDHU @ RAJKUMAR**, S/o.Mohan, aged 32 years, who is now confined in the **Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai** is hereby directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless his presence is required in connection with any other case.

(J.N.B.J.,) (S.S.J.,)
24.09.2025

Index: Yes / No
Internet: Yes / No
ar



H.C.P.No.1674 of 2025

To:

WEB COPY

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai-600 007.
3. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai-600 066.
4. The Inspector of Police (L&O),
R-3, Ashok Nagar Police Station,
Ashok Nagar, Chennai-10.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

J.NISHA BANU, J.
AND
S.SOUNTAR, J.
ar



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1674 of 2025

H.C.P.No.1674 of 2025

24.09.2025