



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 09.04.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N.ANAND VENKATESH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN

H.C.P.(MD) No.61 of 2026

Murugeshwari

.. Petitioner / Mother of the detenu

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by the Additional Chief
Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Madurai City, Madurai District.

3.The Inspector of Police,
Thallakulam Police Station,
Madurai City.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Madurai.

.. Respondents



WEB COPY

Prayer :Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records pertaining to the impugned detention order passed by the 2nd respondent in Detention Order No. 61/BBCDEFGISSSV/2025, dated 22.10.2025 in detaining the detenue under the Tamilnadu Act 14 of 1982 u/s. 2(f) as a Goonda and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenue Lingaraj, S/o.Manikandan, aged about 20 years, who is detained at Central Prison, Madurai, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.Santhanam Rajesh Kumar.B
For : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar
Respondents Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu, by name, Lingaraj, S/o.Manikandan, aged about 20 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in No.61/BBCDEFGISSSV/2025, dated 22.10.2025 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.

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 37 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.



WEB COPY

6. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in No.61/BBCDEFGISSSV/2025, dated 22.10.2025, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Lingaraj, S/o.Manikandan, aged about 20 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.)
09.04.2026

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No

Indu

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Madurai City, Madurai District.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
Thallakulam Police Station,
Madurai City.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Madurai.
- 5.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.61 of 2026

09.04.2026