



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 06.04.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N.ANAND VENKATESH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN

H.C.P.(MD)No.204 of 2026

S.Thavamani

.. Petitioner/Father of the Detenue

Vs.

1.The State of Tamilnadu,
Rep by the Additional Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Chennai - 9.

2.The District Collector Cum District Magistrate,
O/o.The Collectorate, Madurai.

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Madurai.

.....Respondents

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 proceedings of the 2nd respondent made in his proceedings in No.B.B.C.D.E.F.G.I.S.S.S.V.No.80/2025, dated 26.10.2025 and quash the same and set the petitioner's son by name Pradeep, S/o.Thavamani, aged 27



years at liberty from 3rd respondent.

WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Prithviraj

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the father of the detenu, by name Pradeep, S/o.Thavamani, aged 27 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in B.B.C.D.E.F.G.I.S.S.S.V.No.80/2025, dated 26.10.2025 holding him to be a "Drug Offender", as contemplated under Section 2(e) of the Tamil Nadu Prevention Detention Act, 1982 (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. Though several grounds have been raised in the Habeas Corpus Petition, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would mainly focus his argument on the ground that there is no adverse case against the detenu. The ground case involved 4 kgs of ganja, which is also an intermediate quantity, for which, FIR was registered in Crime No.347 of 2025. The detenu was arrested on 01.10.2025, whereas, the detention order was passed only on 26.10.2025.

4. It was contended that only the intermediate quantity was involved, whereas the Detaining Authority in a casual manner has passed the detention order in a case where such an order is not warranted.

5. We are of the view that the quantity that is alleged to have been seized is only an intermediate quantity. Hence, it is not a serious offence under the NDPS Act, since it does not involve any commercial quantity, warranting passing of a detention order and the detenu could have been dealt with under regular penal law that is already available and there was no need for resorting to detention order under Act 14 of 1982.



6. For this purpose, we rely on the judgment in ***Rekha vs. State of Tamil Nadu (2011 (5) SCC 244)***.

7. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in No.B.B.C.D.E.F.G.I.S.S.S.V.No.80/2025, dated 26.10.2025 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Pradeep, S/o.Thavamani, aged 27 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.)
06.04.2026

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No

Indu



To

WEB COPY

1. The Additional Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Chennai - 9.
2. The District Collector Cum District Magistrate,
O/o. The Collectorate, Madurai.
3. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Madurai.
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.204 of 2026

06.04.2026