



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 26-11-2025

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE N. SATHISH KUMAR
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN**

H.C.P No. 2037 of 2025

1. Vellaipandi Alias Kasi
S/o.Sentraiyar, Ward No.15. South
Street, Devadanapatty, Periyakulam,
Theni District.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

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

2.The District Collector and District
Magistrate
Coimbatore District, Coimbatore.

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

4.The Superintendent of Police
Coimbatore District, Coimbatore.

5.The Inspector of Police
Annur Police Station, Coimbatore.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

The Habeas Corpus Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus to issue a Writ, Order or



direction more particularly in the nature of a Writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records pertaining to the impugned detention order passed by the 2nd respondent made in his proceedings in Cr.M.P.No.25/G/2025 dated 12.07.2025 in detaining the detenu under Section 2(f) of the Tamilnadu Act 14 of 1982 as a Goonda and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the Detenu namely Vellaipandi Alias Kasi S/o.Sentraiyar Male aged about 23 years who is now detained in Central Prison, Coimbatore before this Court and set him at liberty and pass such other orders as this Court.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. O.S.Thilak Pasumbadiyar

For Respondent(s): Mr. A. Gokulakrishnan
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by N.SATHISH KUMAR J.)

The petitioner/ detenu viz., Vellaipandi @ Kasi, aged about 23 years, S/o.Sentraiyar, confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 12.07.2025 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. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents. We have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.



WEB COPY

HCP No. 2037 of 2025





WEB COPY

3. Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner pointed out that, the bail order in CrI.M.P.No.6637 of 2024 dated 16.11.2024, relied upon by the Detaining Authority is not similar to the case on hand. Therefore, the learned counsel submitted 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.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would also fairly state that the similar case relied upon by the detaining authority is not a similar one.

5. On perusal of the records, this Court finds that the case relied upon by the Detaining Authority, in CrI.M.P.No.6637 of 2024 dated 16.11.2024 is not similar to the case on hand and the bail was granted to the accused therein, mainly on the ground that he has no previous case. But in this case, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that three adverse cases are pending against the detenu. Hence, this Court is of the view that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority that the detenu is also likely to be released on bail, by relying upon the aforesaid similar case, suffers from non-application of mind.



WEB COPY

6. 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 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.”



WEB COPY

7. 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.

8. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 12.07.2025 in Cr.M.P.No.25/G/2025 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is **allowed**. The detenu viz., **Vellaipandi @ Kasi**, aged 23 years, **S/o Sentraiyan**, confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case.

(N.SATHISH KUMAR J.) (M.JOTHIRAMAN J.)
26-11-2025

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

Mrp

To

1. The Principal Secretary to
Government, Home, Prohibition and
Excise Department, Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.



2. The District Collector and District Magistrate
Coimbatore District, Coimbatore.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Coimbatore.
4. The Superintendent of Police
Coimbatore District, Coimbatore.
5. The Inspector of Police
Annur Police Station, Coimbatore.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras, Chennai.



WEB COPY

HCP No. 2037 of 2025



**N.SATHISH KUMAR J.
AND
M.JOTHIRAMAN J.**

Mrp

H.C.P No. 2037 of 2025

26-11-2025