



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 08.04.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN

H.C.P.(MD)No.307 of 2026

Thuda Ram @ Dudha Ram

.. Petitioner / Father of the
detenu

Vs.

1.The State of Tamilnadu,
Represented by the Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Exercise Department,
Fort St. George, Secretariat,
Chennai.

2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector,
Tiruchirappalli District.

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

4.State of Tamilnadu,
Represented by the Inspector of Police,
Samayapuram Police Station,
Tiruchirappalli District.
Crime No.427/2025.

.. 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 relating to the detention order in Cr.M.P.No.92/2025, dated 31.10.2025 and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenue namely Pradeep, son of Thuda Ram @ Dudha Ram, aged about 24 years, now detained as Goonda at Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Rajaboopathy

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar
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, son of Thuda Ram @ Dudha Ram, aged about 24 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Cr.M.P.No.92/2025, dated 31.10.2025 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 42 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 Cr.M.P.No.92/2025, dated 31.10.2025, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Pradeep, son of Thuda Ram @ Dudha Ram, 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.)
08.04.2026

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No

Indu



WEB COPY

- To
1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Exercise Department,
Fort St. George, Secretariat,
Chennai.
 2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector,
Tiruchirappalli District.
 3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli District.
 4. The Inspector of Police,
Samayapuram Police Station,
Tiruchirappalli District.
 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.307 of 2026

08.04.2026