



HCP(MD)No. 212 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 26.08.2025

CORAM:

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

THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA

HABEAS CORPUS PETITION(MD)No.212 of 2025

Pottukadalai @ Periyasamy

... Petitioner

vs.

1. The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.

2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector,
Dindigul District.

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

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 of the respondent No.2 in Detention Order No.118/2024, dated 11.12.2024 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Pottukadalai @ Periyasamy, Son of Nanthakumar, aged about 25 years, now confining at Madurai Central Prison, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.



HCP(MD)No. 212 of 2025

For Petitioner : Dr.R. Alagumani

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

WEB COPY

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the detenu viz., Pottukadalai @ Periyasamy, Son of Nanthakumar, aged about 25 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Detention Order No.118/2024, dated 11.12.2024, 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.

3. Though several points have been raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner, it is submitted that the detention order is liable to be quashed on the ground that the document furnished at Page No. 25 of Volume I of the booklet contains two remand orders — one dated 21.11.2024 and another dated



HCP(MD)No. 212 of 2025


28.11.2024 in English. However, the translation of the entries dated 21.11.2024

has not been furnished to the detenu. Hence, it is contended that the detenu was deprived of the opportunity to make an effective representation.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor fairly submitted that the translation of the entries dated 21.11.2024 in Volume I of the booklet was not furnished to the detenu.

5. Upon a perusal of the booklet, it is evident that the translated version of the entries dated 21.11.2024 at Page No. 25, Volume I of the Booklet, has not been furnished to the detenu. The non-furnishing of the translation of such a vital document has the effect of depriving the detenu of making an effective representation 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



HCP(MD)No. 212 of 2025

which can be understood by the detenu, is imperative. The relevant portion of

WEB COPY 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. 212 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 the translated version of the entries dated 21.11.2024 at Page No. 25, Volume I of the Booklet, has not been furnished to the detenu. This non furnishing of 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 Detention Order No.118/2024, dated 11.12.2024, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Pottukdalai @ Periyasamy, Son of Nanthakumar, aged about 25 years, is directed to be released forthwith



HCP(MD)No. 212 of 2025

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

WEB COPY

[A.D.J.C., J.] [R.P., J.]
26.08.2025

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

trp

To:

1. The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.

2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector,
Dindigul District.

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

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

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No. 212 of 2025

**AND
R.POORNIMA, J.**

trp

**ORDER MADE IN
HCP(MD)No. 212 of 2025**

DATED : 26.08.2025