



H.C.P.(MD)No.1139 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 29.01.2026

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN
AND
THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R. POORNIMA**

H.C.P.(MD)No.1139 of 2025

Singaraj

... Petitioner

-VS-

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

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

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

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India
praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records

Page 1 of 5



H.C.P.(MD)No.1139 of 2025

connected with the detention order passed in H.S(M)Confdl.No.60/2025, dated 30.06.2025, on the file of the second respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's son namely Vignesh, S/o.Singaraj, aged about 25 years, who is now detained in Central Prison, Palayamkottai before this court and him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Prabu

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

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by **G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN,J.**)

The petitioner is the father of the detenu viz., Vignesh, son of Singaraj, aged about 25 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in H.S(M)Confdl.No.60 of 2025, dated 30.06.2025, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this habeas corpus petition.



H.C.P.(MD)No.1139 of 2025

WEB COPY

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. The learned counsel for the petitioner raised a ground that the detenu was provided with illegible copy of the documents, which were annexed in the booklet, therefore, the detenu could not able to make out a effective representation. On perusal of the those documents, which were not relied upon by the detaining authority to detain the detenue under Act, 14 of 1982.

4. Further, on perusal of the representation submitted by the detenu also did not even whisper about the same. Therefore, even assuming that there are some of the pages are illegible, it is not caused any prejudice to the detenu to make a effective representation. Hence, this Court finds no ground to interfere with the order of the detaining authority.



H.C.P.(MD)No.1139 of 2025

WEB COPY

5. Accordingly, this Habeas Corpus Petition is dismissed.

[G.K.I., J.] [R.P., J.]
29.01.2026

am

NCC :Yes/No

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

To

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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.1139 of 2025

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

am

H.C.P.(MD)No.1139 of 2025

29.01.2026