

HCP(MD)No. 517 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 26.08.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

and

THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA

HABEAS CORPUS PETITION(MD)No. 517 of 2025

Kothurani

... Petitioner

VS.

1. The State of Tamil Naadu
rep. by the Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thanjavur District.
Thanjavur.

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

Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entice records in connection with the Detention Order P.D.No.74/2024, dated 19.12.2024 passed by the 2nd respondent on the petitioner's husband namely Annadurai (44/24) son of



HCP(MD)No. 517 of 2025

Chinnamuthur, Kadarkarai Street, Karanguda, Sethubavachathiram Post, Peravurani Taluk, Thanjavur District has been detained and brand as “Drug Offender” under Section 3(1) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982, and confined at Central Prison, Trichy to set aside he same and to produce him before thi Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr. M. Maran


For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by **A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.**]

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Annadurai, son of Chinnamuthur, aged about 44 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in P.D.No.74/2024, dated 19.12.2024, holding him to be a "Drug offender", as contemplated under Section 2(e) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this habeas corpus petition.


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.



HCP(MD)No. 517 of 2025

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that, though in paragraph No. 7 of the grounds of detention it is stated that Tmt. Kodhurani, wife of Annadurai, is taking action to take out her husband Annadurai, on bail in the case registered in Crime No.306 of 2024, for the offence under Sections 8(c) r/w. 20(b)(ii)(C), 25 and 29(2)(a) of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 on the file of the Peravurani Police Station, there is no material evidence to substantiate this claim. Therefore, it is evident that the detaining authority, without sufficient material, has mechanically arrived at the subjective satisfaction based solely on the information provided by the sponsoring authority. As such, the entire detention order stands vitiated and is liable to be set aside.

4. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor, on instructions, submitted that after satisfying with the materials placed by the Sponsoring Authority, the Detaining Authority has passed the impugned detention order with proper application of mind and there is no illegality or infirmity in the detention order and hence, prayed for dismissal of the habeas corpus petition. He would further submit that the final report has been filed in this case after grant of extension by the trial Court.



HCP(MD)No. 517 of 2025

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and on perusal of the records, we find that there is nothing on record to show that Tmt. Kodhurani, wife of Annadurai, is taking steps to take out her husband viz., Annadurai, on bail in the case registered in Crime No.306 of 2024, for the offence under Sections 8(c) r/w. 20(b)(ii)(C), 25 and 29(2)(a) of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 on the file of the Peravurani Police Station. Therefore, the detention order is vitiated on the ground of non-application of mind.

6. In the light of the above discussion, we have no hesitation in quashing the order of detention on the ground of non-application of mind on the part of the detaining authority in passing the impugned detention order.

7. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in P.D.No.74 of 2024, dated 19.12.2024, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Annadurai, son of Chinnamuthur, aged about 44 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case. It is made clear that quashing of detention order will not entitle the detenu for grant of bail. The trial Court shall independently consider the bail application taking into consideration of



HCP(MD)No. 517 of 2025

Section 37 of the NDPS Act.

WEB COPY

[A.D.J.C., J.] [R.P., J.]
26.08.2025

Index : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No
trp

To:

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thanjavur District.
Thanjavur.

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

4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madars High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No. 517 of 2025

**A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.
AND
R.POORNIMA, J.**

trp

**ORDER MADE IN
HCP(MD)No.517 of 2025**

DATED : 26.08.2025