



HCP(MD)No.893 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 05.01.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

and

THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA

HABEAS CORPUS PETITION(MD)No.893 of 2025

L.Kannimari

... Petitioner

vs.

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

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate
Tenkasi District, Tenkasi

3. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison,
Palayamkotai, Tirunelveli

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records in detention order passed in MHS Confdl No.36 of 2025 dated 12.05.2025 on the file of the second respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu or body of the detenu namely the petitioner's grand son, ie., Rajkumar, alias Gopi, aged about



HCP(MD)No.893 of 2025

18 years , S/o.Dharmar now detained at the Central Prison, Palayamkottai before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Pragalathan

For Respondents: Mr.T.Senthil Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.]

This Habeus Corpus Petition has been filed to quash the detention order passed by the second respondent in MHS Confdl No.36 of 2025 dated 12.05.2025 and direct the respondents to produce the detenu or body of the detenu namely the petitioner's grand son, ie., Rajkumar, alias Gopi, aged about 18 years , S/o.Dharmar now detained at the Central Prison, Palayamkottai before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

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.



HCP(MD)No.893 of 2025

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that at the time of passing detention order the detenu was minor and he has not completed 18 years, therefore the detention order cannot be sustained and the same has to be quashed.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner failed to produce any materials to show the detenu was minor at the time of passing detention order. Further the records also reveals that the detenu has committed very heinous and serious offence as against the minor victim, therefore, this Court finds no infirmity or illegality in the order passed by the second respondent.

5. In the result, the Habeus Corpus Petition stands dismissed.

[G.K.I., J.] [R.P., J.]
05.01.2026

Index : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No
aav



HCP(MD)No.893 of 2025

To:

WEB COPY

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai- 600 009
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate
Tenkasi District, Tenkasi
3. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison,
Palayamkotai, Tirunelveli
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.893 of 2025

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.
AND
R.POORNIMA, J.

aav

HCP(MD)No.893 of 2025

DATED : 05.01.2026