



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 09.06.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE P.B.BALAJI

H.C.P.(MD)No.343 of 2026

G.Jeya

.. Petitioner / mother of the detenu
Vs.

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Madurai City,
Madurai.
- 3.The Prohibition Enforcement Wing Police Station,
Madurai City,
Madurai.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Madurai 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 entire records connected with the impugned detention order passed by the second respondent made in Detention Order No.78/BBCDEFGISSSV/2025, dated 13.12.2025 and quash the same and to direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu, by name, Arunpandi, son of Gopal, aged about 26 years, now confining as 'Drug Offender' at Madurai Central Prison before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.J.Ansari

For Respondents : Mr.G.Karuppasamy Pandian,
Counsel for the State of
Tamil Nadu, Criminal Side

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu, by name, Arunpandi, son of Gopal, aged about 26 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Detention Order No.78/BBCDEFGISSSV/2025, dated 13.12.2025 holding him to be a "Drug Offender", as contemplated under Section 2(e) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.



WEB COPY

2. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned counsel for the State of Tamil Nadu (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondents. We have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.

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 was one adverse case involving small quantity of two kgs of ganja, for which, FIR was registered in Crime No.180 of 2025. The ground case involved 3 kgs of ganja, which is also an intermediate quantify for which, FIR was registered in Crime No.250 of 2025. The detenu was arrested on 14.11.2025, whereas, the detention order was passed only on 13.12.2025.

4. It was contended that in both cases, 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 both in the adverse case as well as in the ground case, the quantity that is alleged to have been seized is only an intermediate quantity. Hence, it is not a serious offence under the NDPS



WEB COPY

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. The another ground that was raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the detenu was arrested on 14.11.2025, whereas, the detention order was passed only on 13.12.2025. Hence, there is a delay of 29 days in passing the detention order and this delay is totally unexplained.

8. 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***.

9. 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.



WEB COPY

10. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Detention Order No.78/BBCDEFGISSSV/2025, dated 13.12.2025 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Arunpandi, son of Gopal, aged about 26 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

(N.A.V.,J..) (P.B.B.,J.,)
09.06.2026

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes / No

TSG


To

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.

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

3.The Prohibition Enforcement Wing Police Station,
Madurai City,
Madurai.

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



5. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

WEB COPY



WEB COPY



**N. ANAND VENKATESH,J.
AND
P.B.BALAJI,J.**

TSG

H.C.P.(MD)No.343 of 2026

09.06.2026