



HCP(MD)No.710 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 28.08.2025

CORAM:

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

THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA

HABEAS CORPUS PETITION(MD)No.710 of 2025

Manikandan alias Andi Manikandan

... Petitioner

VS.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu
rep. by the Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home Prohibition and Excise (xiv) Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of 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, to
issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entice records connected with the
detention order of the 2nd respondent in M.H.S.Confdl.No.13/2025, dated



HCP(MD)No.710 of 2025

25.01.2025 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Manikandan alias Andi Manikandan, Son of Chermakani, aged about 24 years, detained as “Goonda” at Palyamkottai Central Prison before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Dr. R. Alagumani

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 detenu viz., Manikandan alias Andi Manikandan, Son of Chermakani, aged about 24 years. The detenu has 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 "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.



HCP(MD)No.710 of 2025

3. Though several grounds have been raised in the habeas corpus

petition, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the documents furnished at Page No. 41, Volume I of the booklet is partially in English and Partially in Tamil and the petitioner was not furnished with translation of English portions of those documents. It is, therefore, stated that the detenu is deprived of his valuable right to make an effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, this Court finds that the documents furnished at Page No. 41, Volume I of the booklet is partially in English and Partially in Tamil and the petitioner was not furnished with translation of English portions of those documents. Therefore, we are of the view that non furnishing of the translation of English portion of the said document 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.

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



HCP(MD)No.710 of 2025

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:

"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.710 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 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 partial translation of the said document relied on by the Detaining Authority at No.41, Volume I of the booklet is partially in English and Partially in Tamil and the petitioner was not furnished with translation of English portions of those documents, 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.



HCP(MD)No.710 of 2025

We, therefore, have no hesitation in quashing the impugned detention order.

WEB COPY

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., Manikandan alias Andi Manikandan, Son of Chermakani, 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.]

28.08.2025

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

trp

To:

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home Prohibition and Excise (xiv) Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of 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 Madars High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.710 of 2025

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

trp

**ORDER MADE IN
HCP(MD)No.710 of 2025**

DATED : 28.08.2025