

Company: Sol Infotech Pvt. Ltd.

Website: www.courtkutchehry.com

Printed For:

Date: 23/10/2025

D.M. Anwar Vs The Superintendent of Police, Madurai District, Madurai, The Inspector of Police, Melavalavu Police Station, The Inspector of Police, Anna Nagar Police Station, Madurai District and Pandi
P. Pandi Vs The Commissioner of Police, O/o. Commissioner of Police, Madurai District, The Inspector of Police, Anna Nagar Police Station, Madurai District and P. Alifkhan

H.C.P (MD) No"s. 912 and 882 of 2011

Court: Madras High Court (Madurai Bench)

Date of Decision: Oct. 31, 2011

Hon'ble Judges: V. Periya Karuppiah, J; M. Jaichandren, J

Bench: Division Bench

Advocate: P. Prabhu, Habeas Corpus Petition No. 912 of 2011 and Mr. S. Suresh, Habeas Corpus Petition No. 882 of 2011, for the Appellant; A. Ramar for Respondent 1 to 3 Addl. Public Prosecutor and Mr. T. Lajapathi Roy, for respondent No. 4, H.C.P (MD) No. 912 of 2011, Mr. A. Ramar, Assistant Public Prosecutor for Respondents 1 and 2, Habeas Corpus Petition No. 882

of 2011, for the Respondent

Final Decision: Dismissed

Judgement

@JUDGMENTTAG-ORDER

M. Jaichandren, J.

Habeas Corpus Petition No. 912 of 2011 hasbeen filed by the petitioner to direct the Respondents, to produce the

petitioner"s brother, namely, M. Alif Khan, aged about 22 years, before this Court and to set him at liberty.

2. Habeas Corpus Petition No. 882 of 2011has been filed by the petitioner to direct the Respondents, to produce the petitioner"sdaughter,

namely, P. Muthulakshmi, aged about 21 years, before this Court and to set her atliberty.

3. The detenu, namely, M. Alif Khan, and the detenue, namely, P. Muthulakshmi, had been produced before this Court, by the third respondent,

today. On enquiry, the detenu, namely, M. Alif Khan, had stated that he had married P. Muthulakshmi, aged about 20 years, the daughter of the

fourth respondent, on his own volition.

4. The detenu, M. Alif Khan, had submitted that he had married, P. Muthulakshmi, in the month of September, 2011, at Coimbatore and the

marriage had taken place, voluntarily, by mutual consent, as no one had compelled them to enter into the marriage.

5. The father of Muthulakshmi, who was also present in Court, had stated that if his daughter, namely, P. Muthulakshmi had already married, as

claimed by her, he would not interfere in such a marriage.

6. The petitioner, in H.C.P(MD)No. 912 of 2011, is also present before this Court. On enquiry, he had stated that he would not interfere in the

peaceful married life of the detenue, Muthulakhsmi, in any manner.

7. In such circumstances, both M. Alif Khan and P. Muthulakshmi, having been produced before this Court, are set at liberty. Consequently the

Habeas Corpus Petitions stand closed.