

H.C.P.(MD)No.512 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 17.09.2025

CORAM:

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

H.C.P.(MD)No.512 of 2025

Esakkiyammal

... Petitioner

-VS-

1. The State of Tamilnadu, Rep By,
The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (xiv) Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Palayamkottai Central Prison,
Tirunelveli District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records, connected with the detention order of the respondent No.2 in M.H.S.Confdl No.13/2025 dt 25.01.2025 and quash the same and direct



H.C.P.(MD)No.512 of 2025

the respondents to produce the detenu by name Siva Narayanan, S/o.Thangaraj, aged about 23 years, now detained in Palayamkottai Central Prison before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Vinoth Bharathi

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu namely Siva Narayanan, son of Thangaraj, aged about 23 years. The detenu had been detained by the second respondent by his order in M.H.S.Confdl No. 13/2025 dated 25.01.2025, 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



H.C.P.(MD)No.512 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 copy of the 'Remand Order' relied on by the Detaining Authority, more particularly at Page No.65 of the booklet and the Remand Order, furnished to the detenu, has not been properly translated in the vernacular language at Page No.71 of the booklet. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that Page No.65 of the Booklet, which is the 'Remand Order', furnished to the detenu, is illegible. It is seen that Page No.71 of the Booklet, which is the Remand Order, furnished to the detenu, has not been properly translated in the vernacular language. This improper translation of vernacular language and furnishing of illegible copy of the vital document would deprive the



H.C.P.(MD)No.512 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.512 of 2025


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.

...

...

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 improper translation of the Remand Order made by the authority concerned, which is available at Page No.71, in the vernacular language and non-furnishing of legible copy of the document relied on by the Detaining Authority at Page No.65



H.C.P.(MD)No.512 of 2025

WEB COPY

of the Booklet. This furnishing of improper translation in the vernacular language and illegible copy 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.

7. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in M.H.S.Confdl No.13/2025 dated 25.01.2025 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Siva Narayanan, son of Thangaraj, aged about 23 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.]

17.09.2025

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



H.C.P.(MD)No.512 of 2025

WEB COPY

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (xiv) Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Palayamkottai Central Prison,
Tirunelveli District.
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.512 of 2025

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

vsm

H.C.P.(MD)No.512 of 2025

17.09.2025