



*HCP(MD)No. 73 of 2025*

**BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT**

WEB COPY

**DATED : 13.08.2025**

**CORAM:**

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA  
and**

**THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE L. VICTORIA GOWRI**

**HABEAS CORPUS PETITION(MD)No.73 of 2025**

Arumukkani

... Petitioner

VS.

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

2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,  
O/o. the District Magistrate and District Collector,  
Virudhunagar District.

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

4.The Inspector of Police,  
Rajapalayam North Police Station,  
Virudhunagar District.  
(Crime No.352 of 2024)

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to  
issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records relating to the detention  
order in Cr.M.P.No.25/2024, dated 15.12.2024 and quash the same and



**HCP(MD)No. 73 of 2025**

consequently, direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu namely Dharmalingam @ Vellaiyan, son of Mahalingam, aged about 34 years now detained as “Goonda” at Central Prison, Madurai and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.D. Rajaboopathy


For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar  
Additional Public Prosecutor

### **ORDER**

[Order of the Court was made by **A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.**]

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Dharmalingam @ Vellaiyan, son of Mahalingam, aged about 34 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his detention order in Cr.M.P.No.25/2024, dated 15.12.2024, 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.

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.



**HCP(MD)No. 73 of 2025**

3. Though several points have been raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner, it is stated that the detention order is liable to be quashed on the ground that the documents relied on by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent at Page Nos.31 to 37, Volume I of the Booklet are in English and the translated copies have not been furnished to the detenu. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor fairly submitted that the translated copies of Page Nos.31 to 37, Volume I of the Booklet were not furnished to the detenu.

5. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is found that the translated version of the documents at Page Nos. 31 to 37, Volume I of the Booklet have not been furnished to the detenu. This non furnishing of translated copies of the vital documents would deprive the detenu of making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention.

6. In this context, it is useful to refer to the Judgment of the Honourable Supreme Court in the case of ***Powanammal vs. State of Tamil Nadu, reported in (1999) 2 SCC 413***, wherein the Apex Court, after discussing



**HCP(MD)No. 73 of 2025**

the safeguards embodied in Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India, observed

WEB COPY

that the detenu should be afforded an opportunity of making a representation effectively against the detention order and that, the failure to supply every material in the language which can be understood by the detenu, is imperative.

The relevant portion of the said decision is extracted hereunder:

*"9. However, this Court has maintained a distinction between a document which has been relied upon by the detaining authority in the grounds of detention and a document which finds a mere reference in the grounds of detention. Whereas the non-supply of a copy of the document relied upon in the grounds of detention has been held to be fatal to continued detention, the detenu need not show that any prejudice is caused to him. This is because the non-supply of such a document would amount to denial of the right of being communicated the grounds and of being afforded the opportunity of making an effective representation against the order. But it would not be so where the document merely finds a reference in the order of detention or among the grounds thereof. In such a case, the detenu's complaint of non-supply of document has to be supported by prejudice caused to him in making an effective representation. What applies to a document would equally apply to furnishing a translated copy of the document in the language known to and understood by*



WEB COPY



**HCP(MD)No. 73 of 2025**

*the detenu, should the document be in a different language.*

...

...

*16. For the above reasons, in our view, the nonsupply of the Tamil version of the English document, on the facts and in the circumstances, renders her continued detention illegal. We, therefore, direct that the detenue be set free forthwith unless she is required to be detained in any other case. The appeal is accordingly allowed."*

7. We find that the above cited *Powanammal's* case applies in all force to the case on hand as we find that the translated copies of the Page Nos. 31 to 37 have not been furnished to the detenu. This furnishing of improper translation in the vernacular language, to the detenu, has impaired his constitutional right to make an effective representation against the impugned preventive detention order. To be noted, this constitutional right is ingrained in the form of a safeguard in Clause (5) of Article 22 of the Constitution of India. We, therefore, have no hesitation in quashing the impugned detention order.

8. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Cr.M.P.No.25/2024, dated 15.12.2024, passed by the second



**HCP(MD)No. 73 of 2025**

respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Dharmalingam @ Vellaiyan, son of

Mahalingam, aged about 34 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his

detention is required in connection with any other case.

**[A.D.J.C., J.] [L.V.G., J.]**  
**13.08.2025**

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

trp

To:

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to the Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Fort St. George,  
Secretariat, Chennai -600 009.

2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,  
O/o. the District Magistrate and District Collector,  
Virudhunagar District.

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

4.The Inspector of Police,  
Rajapalayam North Police Station,  
Virudhunagar District.

5. The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madars High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



***HCP(MD)No. 73 of 2025***

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.  
AND  
L. VICTORIA GOWRI, J.

trp

**ORDER MADE IN  
HCP(MD)No. 73 of 2025**

**DATED : 13.08.2025**