

H.C.P.(MD) No.948 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 23.09.2025

CORAM:

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

H.C.P.(MD) No.948 of 2025


Asina Begam

...Petitioner/Sister of the detenu

Vs.

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. By Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009.
 - 2.The Commissioner of Police,
City Police Office,
Tiruchirappalli-620 020.
 - 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli-620 020.
- ... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to
issue a writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records in connection with
the Detention Order passed by the second respondent vide her



H.C.P.(MD) No.948 of 2025

WEB COPY

proceedings in C.No.15/Detention/C.P.O./TC/2025, dated 22.02.2025 and quash the same illegal and void and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of detenu Naina Mohamed (Pettai) S/o.Selvam, aged 24 years, who has been termed as "Goonda" and now confined in Central Prison, Trichy before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Karthikeyan
For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the sister of the detenu, Naina Mohamed (Pettai), aged about 24 years S/o.Selvam. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by her order in C.No.15/Detention/C.P.O/TC/2025, dated 22.02.2025 holding him to be a "Drug Offender", as contemplated under Section 2(e) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.



H.C.P.(MD) No.948 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 Remand Order in English version at Page No.27 is improperly translated in Tamil at Page No.28 of the first 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 Nos.27 & 28 of the first Booklet, which is the Remand Order, furnished to the detenu, is improperly translated in Tamil. This improper translation of the vital document would deprive the detenu of making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention.



H.C.P.(MD) No.948 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.948 of 2025


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 improper translation of Remand Order relied on by the Detaining Authority at Page Nos.27 & 28 of the first booklet. This improper translation of the Remand Order has impaired his constitutional



H.C.P.(MD) No.948 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 C.No.15/Detention/C.P.O/TC/2025, dated 22.02.2025 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Naina Mohamed (Pettai), aged about 24 years S/o.Selvam, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[C.V.K., J.] [R.V., J.]

23.09.2025

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
am



H.C.P.(MD) No.948 of 2025

WEB COPY

To:

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
City Police Office,
Tiruchirappalli-620 020.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli-620 020.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.948 of 2025

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

am

H.C.P.(MD) No.948 of 2025

23.09.2025