



HCP(MD)No.747 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 26.08.2025

CORAM:

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

THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA

HABEAS CORPUS PETITION(MD)No.747 of 2025

Puvitha

... Petitioner

vs.

1. The State of Tamil Naadu
The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Pudukkottai District.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.

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 in detention order PDO.No.16/2024, by the 2nd respondent dated 30.11.2024 quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to produce the detenue petitioner's husband namely Stanli Christopher, S/o. Tharmalingam, male aged 37 years (Now detained at Central Prison, Thiruchirappalli) before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.



HCP(MD)No.747 of 2025

WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Ms. P. Vimala
For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

[Order of the Court was made by **A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.**]

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Stanli Christopher, S/o. Tharmalingam, aged about 37 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his detention order in PDO.No.16/2024, dated 30.11.2024, 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 relied on by the 2nd respondent at Page No.86,



HCP(MD)No.747 of 2025

Volume I of the Booklet is in English and the translated copy has not been furnished to the detenu and further illegible. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor fairly submitted that the translated copies of Page No.86, Volume I of the Booklet was not furnished to the detenu.

5. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is found that the translated version of the documents at Page No. 86, Volume I of the Booklet has not been furnished to the detenu and further illegible. This non furnishing of translated copy of the vital document would deprive the detenu of making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention.

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.747 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:

"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 the detenu, should the document be in a different language.

...

...



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.747 of 2025

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."

7. 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 document at Page No.86 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.

8. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in PDO.No.16/2024, dated 30.11.2024, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Stanli Christopher, S/o. Tharmalingam, aged about 37 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case. However, it is made clear that



HCP(MD)No.747 of 2025

quashing of the detention order will not entitle the petitioner for grant of bail.

WEB COPY The Trial Court shall independently dispose the bail application taking into consideration of Section 37 of the NDPS Act.

[A.D.J.C., J.] [R.P., J.]
26.08.2025

Index : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No
trp

To:

The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Pudukkottai District.

3. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.

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



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.747 of 2025

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

trp

**ORDER MADE IN
HCP(MD)No.747 of 2025**

DATED : 26.08.2025