



HCP(MD)No.116 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 09.07.2025

CORAM:

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

THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA

HABEAS CORPUS PETITION(MD)No.116 of 2025

S. Mariammal

... Petitioner

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,
Thoothukudi District,
Thoothukudi.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records, connected with the detention order passed in H.S(M).Confdl.No.128 / 2024, dated 24.10.2024 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



HCP(MD)No.116 of 2025

son ie., Balaji, aged about 29 years, S/o. Ganesan, now detained at the Central Prison, Palayamkottai before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr. N. Pragalathan

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 mother of detenu viz., Balaji, Son of Ganesan aged about 29 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in H.S(M).Confdl.No.128 / 2024, dated 24.10.2024, holding him to be a "Drug Offender", as contemplated under Section 2(e) 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



HCP(MD)No.116 of 2025

ground that no material was placed by the detaining authority before the petitioner or detenu, as if the remand has been extended till 06.11.2024. 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 though the detenu was not furnished with remand extension order, on that score alone, it cannot be quashed. According to the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, no prejudice has been caused to the detenu and therefore prays for dismissal of the habeas corpus petition.

5. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that the remand extension copy has not been furnished to the detenu. Non furnishing of remand extension copy, which is a vital document would deprive the detenu 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



HCP(MD)No.116 of 2025

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



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.116 of 2025


...

...

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 remand extension copy was furnished to the detenu. The non furnishing of remand extension 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 H.S(M).Confdl.No.128 / 2024, dated 24.10.2024, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Balaji, Son of Ganesan, aged



HCP(MD)No.116 of 2025

about 29 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is

required in connection with any other case.

[A.D.J.C., J.] [R.P., J.]
09.07.2025

Index : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No
trp

To:

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai -9.

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

3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli.

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



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.116 of 2025

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

AND

R.POORNIMA, J.

trp

ORDER MADE IN
HCP(MD)No.116 of 2025

DATED : 09.07.2025