



H.C.P.(MD)No.607 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Date of Reserving the Order	Date of Pronouncing the Order
09.10.2025	23.10.2025

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.V.KARTHIKEYAN
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.VIJAYAKUMAR**

H.C.P.(MD)No.607 of 2025

Abdul Kareem

... Petitioner / Brother of the Detenu

VS.

1.State Represented by,
The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home (Prohibition and Excise) Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 9.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Collector's Office,
Kanniyakumari District at Nagercoil,

3.The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli District.

... Respondents



H.C.P.(MD)No.607 of 2025

Prayer: Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the detention order passed by the second respondent in P.D.No.01/2025, dated 22.01.2025, by setting aside the said order of detention passed by the second respondent and setting the detenu namely, Faisalkhan, S/o.Bahurudeen, aged about 40 years, now detained at Central Prison, Palayamkottai, at liberty.

For Petitioner

: Mr.R.Muthuram

For Respondents

: Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J.

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu *viz.*, Faisalkhan, aged about 40 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent in P.D.No.01/2025, dated 22.01.2025, holding him to be a 'Sexual Offender', as contemplated under Section 2(ggg) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.



H.C.P.(MD)No.607 of 2025

WEB COPY

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.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner pointed out that the detaining authority, in the grounds of detention, referred to a case registered by the All Women Police Station, Nagercoil, in Crime No.16 of 2024. In that case, the offences were initially registered under Section 96 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (B.N.S.), 2023 and later altered to Sections 96 and 351(2) B.N.S., 2023, along with Sections 5(1) and 6 of the POCSO Act, 2012. It was noted that although the accused in that case had not filed a bail application, he was released on bail by the Special Court for Trial of Cases under the POCSO Act, Kanniyakumari. Based on that fact, the detaining authority had recorded a subjective satisfaction that if the detenu in the present case were to file a bail application, there was a real possibility of his release.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner contended that in the present case, the detenu had not filed any bail application and that therefore, there was no



H.C.P.(MD)No.607 of 2025

immediate likelihood of his release. It was contended that the presumption by the detaining authority was speculative and unsustainable. In support of this contention, reliance was placed on the judgment of a Coordinate Division Bench of this Court in **A.Seenivasan vs. State of Tamil Nadu, rep. by its Secretary, Home, Prohibition and Excise Department and others**, reported in **2025 (2) MWN (Cr.) 410 (DB)**, wherein the Division Bench held as follows:-

"4.It is seen from records that the statement obtained by the Sponsoring 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, no crime number has been mentioned. On a perusal of the Grounds of 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 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 Crime Number in 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 mentioned, 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 crime number, the compelling necessity to detain, becomes suspicious. Hence,



H.C.P.(MD)No.607 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 distinguishing factor in the case relied upon by the learned counsel for the petitioner (**A.Seenivasan v. State of Tamil Nadu**, *supra*) was that the crime number was not mentioned in the statement recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C. of the relative of the detenu. On that basis, the Division Bench found that the veracity of such a statement became doubtful, thereby, casting suspicion on the necessity for detention. Consequently, the Division Bench of this Court held that the subjective satisfaction of the detaining authority, which was based on such undated and incomplete material, suffered from non-application of mind.

6. However, in the present case, a perusal of the records clearly shows that the F.I.R. in Crime No.32 of 2024 was specifically referenced on each page of the statements recorded during the course of investigation. The name of the Police Station is also mentioned. Therefore, we are unable to accept the contention that the detaining authority failed to arrive at a valid subjective satisfaction.



H.C.P.(MD)No.607 of 2025

WEB COPY

7. Furthermore, the question whether bail will be granted or not lies solely within the judicial discretion of the concerned Court, and it is not possible to pre-determine the outcome of such applications. Considering the gravity of the offence, wherein the detenu, along with another accused, is alleged to have committed gang rape of a minor victim, the detaining authority was well within its powers to consider the possibility of the detenu being released on bail and to pass the detention order accordingly, in the interest of public order.

8. Accordingly, we reject this ground raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

9. We have also examined the records concerning the representation submitted by the detenu. The representation, dated 18.02.2025, was received on 26.02.2025 and was rejected on 28.02.2025. Intimation of the rejection was communicated on 03.03.2025. It must be noted that 01.03.2025 and 02.03.2025 were declared holidays. We, therefore, find no delay in the consideration or disposal of the representation.



H.C.P.(MD)No.607 of 2025

WEB COPY

10. No other grounds have been urged for consideration. Hence, this Habeas Corpus Petition stands dismissed.

Index : Yes / No
NCC : Yes / No
smn2

[C.V.K., J.] & [R.V., J.]
23.10.2025
(2/2)

To

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home (Prohibition and Excise) Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 9.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Collector's Office,
Kanniyakumari District at Nagercoil,
- 3.The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli District.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.607 of 2025

C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J.
and
R.VIJAYAKUMAR, J.

smn2

PRE-DELIVERY ORDER MADE IN
H.C.P.(MD)No.607 of 2025

23.10.2025
(2/2)