



HCP(MD)No.367 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 04.07.2025

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G. ARUL MURUGAN**

HABEAS CORPUS PETITION(MD)No. 367 of 2025

Pushpa

... Petitioner

VS.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu
rep. by its Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St. George, Chennai -9.

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

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

... 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 by the 2nd respondent in detention order CrI.M.P.No.35 of 2024, dated 08.10.2024 and quash the same and to direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenue by name Veeramalai, Son of Pandiyan, aged about 34 years, now confining as Goonda at Trichy, Central Prison before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.



HCP(MD)No.367 of 2025

For Petitioner : Mr.P. Pratheesh

For Respondents : Mr. A. Thiruvadikumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by **G. ARUL MURUGAN, J.**]

The petitioner is the mother of detenu viz., Veeramalai, Son of Pandiyan, aged about 34 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in CrI.M.P.No.35 of 2024, dated 08.10.2024, 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 grounds have been raised in the habeas corpus petition, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the translated copy of accident register, Page No.16, Volume I of the Book let was not furnished to the petitioner. It is, therefore, stated that the detenu is deprived of his valuable right to make an effective representation.



HCP(MD)No.367 of 2025

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 not furnished with translated copy of the document at Page No.16, Volume I of the Book let, 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, this Court finds that the accident register relied on by the Detaining Authority is in English language. Therefore, we are of the view that it would deprive the detenu of his valuable right to make an effective representation. It is in the said circumstances, this Court finds that the impugned detention order passed by the Detaining Authority is vitiated.

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



HCP(MD)No.367 of 2025

material in the language which can be understood by the detenu, is imperative.

WEB COPY The relevant portion of the said decision is extracted hereunder:

"6. The short question that falls for our consideration is whether failure to supply the Tamil version of the order of remand passed in English, a language not known to the detenue, would vitiate her further detention.

...

...

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



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.367 of 2025

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 non supply 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 non furnishing of translated copy of the accident register, has impaired the detenu's 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



HCP(MD)No.367 of 2025

of detention in Crl.M.P.No.35 of 2024, dated 08.10.2024, passed by the second

WEB COPY

respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Veeramalai, Son of Pandiyan, aged about 34 years, is directed to be released forthwith, unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[A.D.J.C., J.]

[G.A.M., J.]

04.07.2025

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

trp

To:

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

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

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

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



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.367 of 2025

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

AND

G. ARUL MURUGAN, J.

trp

ORDER MADE IN
HCP(MD)No.367 of 2025

DATED : 04.07.2025