



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 16.04.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN

H.C.P.(MD)No.1496 of 2025

Laka Ram

.. Petitioner / Father
of the detenu

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep by the Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.

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

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Trichy.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Samapuram Police Station,
Trichy District.

.. Respondents



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 impugned order of detention made in Cr.M.P.No.99 of 2025, dated 17.11.2025 on the file of the District Collector and District Magistrate, Trichy District, the second respondent herein, branded the petitioner's son / the detenu, by name, Manish Sirohi S/o. Laka Ram, aged about 19 years as Goonda, who is now confined in Central Prison, Trichy and quash the impugned order of detention and set the petitioner at liberty by producing him before this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.J.Ebenezer Charles

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 father of the detenu, by name, Manish Sirohi S/o. Laka Ram, aged about 19 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Cr.M.P.No.99 of 2025, dated 17.11.2025 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 the detenu was arrested on 04.10.2025, whereas, the detention order was passed only on 17.11.2025. There is a delay of nearly 44 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.99 of 2025, dated 17.11.2025, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Manish Sirohi S/o. Laka Ram, aged about 19 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.)
16.04.2026

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes / No

TSG



WEB COPY To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.
- 2 The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Trichy District,
Trichy.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Trichy.
4. The Inspector of Police,
Samapuram Police Station,
Trichy District.
5. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



**N. ANAND VENKATESH,J.
AND
K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN,J.**

TSG

H.C.P.(MD)No.1496 of 2025

16.04.2026