



HCP(MD)No.606 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 17.07.2025

CORAM:

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

THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA

HABEAS CORPUS PETITION(MD)No.606 of 2025

Arunabharathi

... Petitioner

vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Secretariat, Chennai -600 009.

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
O/o. the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tenkasi District, Thenkasi.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Palayamkottai Central Prison,
Tirunelveli 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 MHS.Confdl.No.78/2024, dated 01.10.2024 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu by name Annamalai alias Ranjith, Son of kumar, aged about 24 years, now detained as “Goonda” at Palayamkottai Central Prison, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.



HCP(MD)No.606 of 2025

For Petitioner : Mr. R. Alagumani

WEB COPY

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 sister of detenu viz., Annamalai alias Ranjith, Son of kumar, aged about 24 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in MHS.Confdl.No.78/2024, dated 01.10.2024, 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 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 documents furnished by the detaining authority at page No.113, Part II of the Booklet to arrive at the satisfaction that the detenu is a History Sheeted Rowdy and a part of the document at Page No.113 is in English and the



HCP(MD)No.606 of 2025

translated copy has not been furnished to the detenu. 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 submit that though the translated copy of Page No.113 of the 2nd Booklet has not been served on the detenu, 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 found that the translated version of the documents at Page No.113, Part II of the Booklet has not been furnished to the detenu. This non furnishing of translated copy of the vital documents would deprive the detenu of making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention.

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



HCP(MD)No.606 of 2025

the safeguards embodied in Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India, observed

WEB COPY

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



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.606 of 2025

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 as we find that the translated copy of the Page No.113 has not been furnished to the detenu. This furnishing of improper 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.

7. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in MHS.Confdl.No.78/2024, dated 01.10.2024, passed by the second



HCP(MD)No.606 of 2025

respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Annamalai alias Ranjith, Son of

kumar, aged about 24 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.]

17.07.2025

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

trp

To:

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Secretariat, Chennai -600 009.

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
O/o. the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tenkasi District, Tenkasi.

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

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



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.606 of 2025

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

trp

ORDER MADE IN
HCP(MD)No.606 of 2025

DATED : 17.07.2025