



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 02.04.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN

H.C.P.(MD)No.1491 of 2025

Nithiya

.. Petitioner / Wife of the
Detenu

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep by the Deputy Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 9.

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

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli.

.. 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 2nd respondent in detention order P.D.No.59/2025, dated 15.10.2025 and detained at Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli and quash



the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the petitioner's husband namely Maruthupandiyan, S/o.Thangavelu, male, aged about 32 years and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Jameelarasu
For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu, by name, Maruthupandiyan, S/o.Thangavelu, male, aged about 32 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in P.D.No.59/2025, dated 15.10.2025 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.



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 35 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 P.D.No.59/2025, dated 15.10.2025 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Maruthupandiyan, S/o.Thangavelu,



male, aged about 32 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.,)
02.04.2026

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No

Indu

To

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep by the Deputy Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 9.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thanjavur District.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli.
- 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.1491 of 2025

02.04.2026
(2/4)