



*HCP(MD)No. 291 of 2025*

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

WEB COPY

**DATED : 19.08.2025**

**CORAM:**

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

**THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA**

**HABEAS CORPUS PETITION(MD)No. 291 of 2025**

Abdul Sabeek

... Petitioner

vs.

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,  
Office of the Commissioner of Police,  
Tiruchirappalli City.

3.The Superintendent of Police,  
Trichy Central Prison,  
Trichy District.

... 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 C.No.120 / Detention / C.P.O./T.C/2024, dated 28.12.2024 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Abdul Sabeek, Son of Mohamed Ismail, aged about 23 years, now detained as “Drug Offender” at in Trichy Central Prison before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.



**HCP(MD)No. 291 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., Abdul Sabeek, Son of Mohamed Ismail, aged about 23 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C.No.120 / Detention/C.P.O./T.C/2024, dated 28.12.2024, 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 ground that the detenu was furnished with illegible documents at Page Nos. 23 and 24 of the Volume I of the Booklet. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu



**HCP(MD)No. 291 of 2025**

was deprived of making effective representation.

WEB COPY

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 furnished with illegible documents at Page Nos. 23 and 24 of the Volume I of the Booklet, 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 Page Nos. 23 and 24 of the Volume I of the Booklet, furnished to the detenu, is illegible. Non furnishing of legible and clear copy 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 the safeguards embodied in Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India, observed that the detenu



**HCP(MD)No. 291 of 2025**

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. 291 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."*

6. 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 documents relied on by the Detaining Authority at Page Nos. 23 and 24 of the Volume I of the Booklet have 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.

7. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in C.No.120/Detention/C.P.O./T.C/2024, dated 28.12.2024, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Abdul Sabeek,



**HCP(MD)No. 291 of 2025**

Son of Mohamed Ismail, aged about 23 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.]**  
**19.08.2025**

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 Commissioner of Police,  
Office of the Commissioner of Police,  
Tiruchirappalli City.

3. The Superintendent of Police,  
Trichy Central Prison,  
Trichy District.

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



WEB COPY



***HCP(MD)No. 291 of 2025***

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

trp

**ORDER MADE IN  
HCP(MD)No. 291 of 2025**

**DATED : 19.08.2025**