



H.C.P(MD)No.792 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 19.09.2025

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE C.V.KARTHIKEYAN
and
THE HON'BLE Mr.JUSTICE R.VIJAYAKUMAR**

H.C.P.(MD) No.792 of 2025

Sagaraee

... Petitioner

Vs

1. The State of Tamilnadu,
Rep By the Additional Chief Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Dept,
Fort St.George,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 9..

2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
O/o.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Sivagangai District..

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

4. The Inspector of Police,
Sivagangai Town Police Station,
Sivagangai District.
Cr.No.52 of 2025..

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India,
to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the record relating to the



H.C.P(MD)No.792 of 2025

detention order in Cr.M.P.No.05/Goonda/2025 dated 12.02.2025 and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu namely Marimuthu, S/o.Rajendran, aged about 25 years detained as GOONDA at Central Prison, Madurai, and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Rajaboopathy

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar

Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu viz., Marimuthu S/o.Rajendran, aged about 25 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by Detention Order in Cr.M.P.No.05/Goonda/2025 dated 12.02.2025 branding 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.



H.C.P(MD)No.792 of 2025

WEB COPY

3. Though several grounds have been raised in the Habeas Corpus Petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner focused mainly on the ground that though the detenu has been furnished with the translated copy of the AR copy, at Page Nos.46 and 47 of the booklet, the same is partially translated. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that in Page Nos.46 and 47, which is the AR copy furnished to the detenu, the said AR copy was partially translated and the complete translated version was not furnished to the detenu. Though the detenu has given a representation dated 04.07.2025 sought Tamil Version of the AR copy, the same has not been furnished in vernacular language by translating the same. This non-furnishing of the translated version of the vital document 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,



H.C.P(MD)No.792 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 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



WEB COPY



H.C.P(MD)No.792 of 2025

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. The non-furnishing of fully translated Version of AR copy 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.



H.C.P(MD)No.792 of 2025

WEB COPY

7. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Cr.M.P.No.05/Goonda/2025 dated 12.02.2025 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Marimuthu, S/o.Rajendran, aged about 25 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.)
19.09.2025

Index : Yes / No
NCC : Yes / No
RR

To

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

2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
O/o.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Sivagangai District..

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

4. The Inspector of Police,
Sivagangai Town Police Station,
Sivagangai District.

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

6/7



WEB COPY



H.C.P(MD)No.792 of 2025

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

RR

ORDER MADE IN
H.C.P.(MD) No.792 of 2025

19.09.2025