



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 25.03.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN

H.C.P.(MD)No.27 of 2026

Muneeshwaran

.. Petitioner / Detenu

Vs.

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,
Thoothukudi District, Thoothukudi.

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

.. Respondents

Prayer :Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the entire records, connected with the detention order of the second respondent in H.S.(M).Confdl No.31/2025, dated 04.04.2025 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce



the body or person of the detenu by name, Muneeshwaran, S/o.Etturaj, aged about 24 years, now detained as "Goonda" at Palayamkottai Central Prison before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Alagumani

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by N. ANAND VENKATESH,J.)

The petitioner is the detenu, by name, Muneeshwaran, S/o.Etturaj, aged about 24 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in H.S.(M).Confdl No.31/2025, dated 04.04.2025 holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) of the 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.



WEB COPY

3. Apart from the other grounds raised by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, one of the main ground that was raised is that there is a delay of 29 days in passing the detention order and this delay is totally unexplained.

4. In our considered view, the issue is squarely covered by the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Sushanta Kumar Banik Vs. State of Tripura and Others*** reported in ***2022 SCC Online SC 1333***.

5. The detention order is vitiated due to the fact that there was a solitary case and the live and proximate link between the grounds of detention and the purpose of the detention is completely absent. Hence, this Court is inclined to interfere with the detained order passed by the second respondent.

6. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in H.S.(M).Confdl No.31/2025, dated 04.04.2025, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Muneeshwaran,



S/o.Etturaj, aged about 24 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

(N.A.V.,J..) (K.K.R.K.,J.,)
25.03.2026

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No

Indu

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,
Thoothukudi District, Thoothukudi.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Palayamkottai Central Prison,
Tirunelveli District.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



**N. ANAND VENKATESH,J.
AND
K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN,J.**

Indu

H.C.P.(MD) No.27 of 2026

25.03.2026