



H.C.P.(MD)No.312 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 11.11.2025

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.V.KARTHIKEYAN
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.VIJAYAKUMAR**

H.C.P.(MD)No.312 of 2025

Vijaya

... Petitioner

-VS-

1. State through Tamilnadu, Rep by
The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
O/o. the District Collector,
Thanjavur District.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Trichy.
4. The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Pattukottai,
Thanjavur District.
Crime No. 39/2024

... Respondents



H.C.P.(MD)No.312 of 2025

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the Detention order passed by the 2nd respondent in Detention Order in P.D.No.77/2024 dated 24.12.2024 and to quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu, Suresh (aged 39), S/o.Govindarasu before this Court and set him at liberty, now detained at Central Prison, Trichy.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Ayyanar Prem Kumar

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar,
Addl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by ***C.V.Karthikeyan, J.***)

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu namely Suresh, S/o.Govindarasu, aged about 39 years. The detenu had been detained by the second respondent by his order in P.D.No.77/2024, dated 24.12.2024, holding him to be a “Sexual Offender” as contemplated under Section 2(ggg) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.



H.C.P.(MD)No.312 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 not furnished with the copy of the 'initial Remand Order dated 25.11.2024' relied on by the Detaining Authority. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that the 'initial Remand Order dated 25.11.2024', was not furnished to the detenu. This non-furnishing of the vital document would deprive the detenu of making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention.



H.C.P.(MD)No.312 of 2025

WEB COPY

5. 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:

"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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.312 of 2025

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, 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. The non-furnishing of remand order 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.



H.C.P.(MD)No.312 of 2025

WEB COPY

7. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in P.D.No.77/2024, dated 24.12.2024 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Suresh, S/o.Govindarasu, aged about 39 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[C.V.K., J.] [R.V., J.]

vsm

11.11.2025

Index: Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
NCC : Yes/No



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.312 of 2025

C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J.
and
R.VIJAYAKUMAR, J.

vsm

H.C.P.(MD)No.312 of 2025

11.11.2025