



H.C.P(MD)No.110 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 07.07.2025

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA
and
THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA**

H.C.P(MD)No.110 of 2025

R.Mohammed Afrin

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu

Rep. by the Additional Chief Secretary to the Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,


Tirunelveli City,
Tirunelveli.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,

Central Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli.

... Respondents

Page No.1 of 8



H.C.P(MD)No.110 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 passed in No.68/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 21.10.2024 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu or body of the detenu namely, the petitioner's husband i.e., Ramjankani, aged about 27 years, S/o. Shiek, now detained at Central Prison, Palayamkottai before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr. N. Pragalanathan


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., Ramjankani, S/o.Shiek, aged about 29 years. The detenu has been detained by the 2nd respondent by his order of detention in No.68/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated




H.C.P(MD)No.110 of 2025

21.10.2024 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.

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 detenu was furnished with illegible copy of the Remand report relied on by the Detaining Authority, more particularly at Page No.75 of the booklet. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

4. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents strongly opposed the Habeas Corpus Petition by filing his counter. He would further submit that furnishing of illegible copy of



H.C.P(MD)No.110 of 2025

WEB COPY

Remand report relied on by the Detaining Authority to the detenu, will not cause any prejudice to the detenu and on that score alone, it cannot be quashed.

5. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that Page No.75 of the Booklet, which is the Remand report furnished to the detenu, is illegible. This furnishing of illegible copy of the vital document 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 the safeguards embodied in Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India, observed 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:



WEB COPY



H.C.P(MD)No.110 of 2025

"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 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,



WEB COPY



H.C.P(MD)No.110 of 2025

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 non-furnishing of legible copy of the document relied on by the Detaining Authority at Page No.75 of the Booklet. This furnishing of illegible copy 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 No.68/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 21.10.2024, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Ramjankani, aged about 27 years, S/o.Shiek, is directed to be



H.C.P(MD)No.110 of 2025

WEB COPY

released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[A.D.J.C., J.] [R.P., J.]
07.07.2025

Index : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No
rm

To:

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to the Government
State of Tamil Nadu
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat
Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tirunelveli City,
Tirunelveli.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Thirunelveli.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P(MD)No.110 of 2025

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.
AND
R.POORNIMA, J.

rm

ORDER MADE IN
H.C.P(MD)No.110 of 2025

DATED : 07.07.2025