



H.C.P.(MD) No.1418 of 2024

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 11.06.2025

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA
and
THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA**

H.C.P.(MD) No.1418 of 2024

Gowsalya

... Petitioner

-VS-

1.State of Tamil Nadu Represented
by its Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.

2.The District Magistrate / District Collector
O/o.District Collector,
Dindigul District.

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

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a writ of habeas corpus to call for the entire records connection with the detention order No.85/2024 dated 31.08.2024 passed by the second respondent on



H.C.P.(MD) No.1418 of 2024

WEB COPY

petitioner's husband namely Siva (24/24) son of Vaengaiyan, Door No.3/135, Kottaiyur, Karumaathur, Usilampatti Taluk, Madurai District has been detained and branded as "Goonda" under Section 3(1) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and confined at Central Prison, Palayamkottai to set aside the same and to produce him before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Maran
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 wife of the detenu viz., Siva, son of Vaengaiyan, aged about 24 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Detention Order No.85/2024 dated 31.08.2024, 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.



H.C.P.(MD) No.1418 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 copies at Page Nos.13,47 and 49 and the translated copy of the Arrest/Court Surrender Form Page No.108 to 111 and the Arrest Intimation Form Page No.112 have not been furnished to the detenu. 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.13,47 & 49 furnished to the detenu, are illegible and it is also found that the translated copy of the Arrest/Court Surrender Form Page No.108 to 111 and the Arrest Intimation Form Page No.112 have not been furnished to the detenu. This furnishing of illegible copy and 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.1418 of 2024

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 merely finds a reference in the order of



H.C.P.(MD) No.1418 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 non-furnishing of legible copy of the document relied on by the Detaining Authority at Page Nos.13,47 & 49 of the Booklet and the translated copy of the Arrest/Court Surrender Form Page No.108 to 111 and the Arrest Intimation Form Page No.112 have not been furnished to the



H.C.P.(MD) No.1418 of 2024

WEB COPY

detenu. This furnishing of illegible copy and 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.

7. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Detention Order No.85/2024 dated 31.08.2024, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Siva, aged about 24 years, son of Vaengaiyan, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

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

[A.D.J.C., J.] [R.P., J.]
11.06.2025



H.C.P.(MD) No.1418 of 2024

WEB COPY

To:

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate / District Collector
Dindigul District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Madurai.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.1418 of 2024

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

am

H.C.P.(MD) No.1418 of 2024

11.06.2025