



WEB COPY



HCP.No.3157 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 13-08-2025

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN**

HCP No. 3157 of 2024

Soosaiyammal
W/o.Ganesan
Indhira Nagar, Rajavallipuram,
Tirunelveli Taluk,
Tirunelveli District

Petitioner

Vs

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to
Government
State of Tamil nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (xiv)
Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.

2.The District Collector and District
Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and
District Magistrate,
Tirunelveli District, Tirunelveli.

3.The Superintendent of Prison
Cuddalore Central Prison,
Cuddalore.



HCP.No.3157 of 2024

4. The Superintendent Of Police
Office of The Superintendent of Police,
Tirunelveli District.

5. The Inspector of Police
Taluk Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.

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 of the Respondent No.2 in M.H.S.Confdl No.194/2024 dated 18.11.2024 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Arunkumar alias Arun, S/o.Ganesan aged about 33 years, detained as “Goonda” at Cuddalore Central Prison before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Dr.R.Alagumani

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

ORDER

M.S.RAMESH, J.

and

V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

The petitioner herein, who is the mother of the detenu, Arunkumar alias Arun, aged 33 years, confined in Central Prison, Cuddalore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the



HCP.No.3157 of 2024

second respondent dated 18.11.2024 issued against her son, 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 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 to the accused therein on the ground that the co-accused had been granted bail.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet in Volume-II, this Court finds that the



HCP.No.3157 of 2024

bail order relied upon by the Detaining Authority in Crl.O.P.(MD).No.19503 of 2024 dated 12.11.2024, is not similar to the case on hand, since the accused therein was granted bail on the ground that the co-accused had been granted bail. Therefore, this Court finds that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority is irrational and the detention order is liable to be quashed on the ground of 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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.3157 of 2024

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 order



HCP.No.3157 of 2024

is liable to be quashed.

WEB COPY

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 18.11.2024 in M.H.S.Confdl No.194/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Arunkumar alias Arun, aged 33 years, confined in Central Prison, Cuddalore, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case. No costs.


[M.S.R., J] [V.L.N., J]
13.08.2025

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

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to
Government
State of Tamil nadu,

Page 6 of 8



HCP.No.3157 of 2024

Home, Prohibition and Excise (xiv)
Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.

WEB COPY

2.The District Collector and District
Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and
District Magistrate,
Tirunelveli District, Tirunelveli.

3.The Superintendent of Prison
Cuddalore Central Prison,
Cuddalore.

4.The Superintendent Of Police
Office of The Superintendent of Police,
Tirunelveli District.

5. The Inspector of Police
Taluk Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.

6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

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

vum



WEB COPY



HCP.No.3157 of 2024

HCP No. 3157 of 2024

13.08.2025

(3/7)