



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 04.06.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N.ANAND VENKATESH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN

H.C.P.(MD)No.219 of 2026

Senthilkumari

.. Petitioner / mother of the
detenu

Vs.


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

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
O/o.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Sivagangai District, Sivagangai.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Madurai Central Prison,
Madurai 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 Respondent No.2 in Detention order Cr.M.P.No.



WEB COPY

112/Goonda/2025 dated 01.12.2025 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Vijay S/o.Muthuraman, aged about 21 years, detained as Goonda at Madurai Central Prison, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Srikanth

For Respondents : Mr.G.Karuppasamy Pandiyan
Counsel for State of TN (Cr1.Side)

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu, by name, Vijay S/o.Muthuraman, aged about 21 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Cr.M.P.No.112/Goonda/2025 dated 01.12.2025 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 27 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 Cr.M.P.No.112/Goonda/2025 dated 01.12.2025, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Vijay S/o.Muthuraman,



WEB COPY

aged about 21 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.)
04.06.2026

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No

Indu

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai -9.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
O/o.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Sivagangai District, Sivagangai.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Madurai Central Prison,
Madurai 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.219 of 2026

04.06.2026