



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1706 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 30.10.2025

C O R A M

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN

H.C.P.No.1706 of 2025

Malini

... Petitioner/Detenuer's wife

-VS-

1. State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police,
G7, Chetpet Police Station, Chennai.
4. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai.

... Respondents

Prayer: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records relating to Petitioners husband detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order dated 04.07.2025 on the file of the second respondent herein made in proceedings No.449/BCDFGISSSV/2025 and quash the same as



H.C.P.No.1706 of 2025

illegal and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the said Petitioners husband, namely, Akilan (a) Velliangiri, aged 27 years son of Sakthivel before this Hon'ble High Court and set him at liberty now Petitioners husband detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai - 600 066.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Mohamed Saifulla

For Mr.C.C.Chellappan

For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan

Addl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

The petitioner herein, who is the wife of the detenue, namely, Akilan (a) Velliangiri, S/o.Sakthivel, aged 27 years, detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai has come forward with this petition, challenging the detention order dated 04.07.2025, passed by the second respondent in No.449/BCDFGISSSV/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 Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.



H.C.P.No.1706 of 2025

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 a relative of the detainee is taking steps to take out the detainee on bail, suffers from non-application of mind, as the statement under 180 (iii) of BNSS, said to have been made by the detainee's father before the Sponsoring Authority, is undated. Hence, the learned counsel for the petitioner raised a *bona fide* doubt as to when this statement was obtained from the detainee's father. The learned counsel further pointed out that, unless the statement relied upon by the Sponsoring Authority is immediately before the Detention Order, 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 Authority from the detainee's father , enclosed in the Booklet at Pg.No.48 of Vol.I stating that he has not filed any bail application to bring out the detainee on bail, is not dated. On a perusal of the Grounds of



H.C.P.No.1706 of 2025

Detention, it is seen that, in Para No.4, the Detaining Authority has observed that the Sponsoring Authority has stated that he came to understand that the relative of the detainee is 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 detainee is likely to be released on bail. When the statement obtained by the Sponsoring Authority from the father of the detainee stating that he has not filed any bail application to bring out the detainee on bail is not dated, the veracity of such statement becomes doubtful. The compelling necessity to detain the detainee would also depend on when the statement was obtained. In the absence of the date, the compelling necessity to detain, becomes suspicious. 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 without an application of mind. In case, any of the reasons stated in



H.C.P.No.1706 of 2025

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 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.”



H.C.P.No.1706 of 2025

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. For the aforesaid reasons, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the Detention Order passed by the Second Respondent in No.449/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 04.07.2025 is hereby set aside. The detainee, viz., Akilan (a) Velliangiri, S/o.Sakthivel, aged 27 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.

(N.S.K,J.,) (M.J.R,J.,)
30.10.2025

Index: Yes / No
Internet: Yes / No
ar



H.C.P.No.1706 of 2025

WEB COPY To:

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police,
G7, Chetpet Police Station, Chennai.
4. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai.
5. The Joint Secretary to Government
Public (Law & Order),
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1706 of 2025

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.
AND
M.JOTHIRAMAN, J.
ar

H.C.P.No.1706 of 2025

30.10.2025