



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.47 of 2026

Mangilal

.. Petitioner / detenu

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,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Trichirappalli.
 - 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Tiruchirappalli 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 records relating to the detention order of the second respondent in Cr.M.P.No.100 of 2025 dated 17.11.2025



WEB COPY

and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu, by name, Mangilal, son of Kanaram, aged about 22 years, now detained as Goonda at Trichy Central Prison before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.Dr.R.Alagumani

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 detenu, by name, Mangilal, son of Kanaram, aged about 22 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Cr.M.P.No.100 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.



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 the detenu was arrested on 05.10.2025, whereas, the detention order was passed only on 17.11.2025. There is a delay of nearly 43 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 Cr.M.P.No.100 of 2025, dated 17.11.2025, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz. Mangilal, son of Kanaram,



WEB COPY

aged about 22 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

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Trichirappalli.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Tiruchirappalli 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.**

TSG

H.C.P.(MD)No.47 of 2026

16.04.2026