



*HCP(MD)No.1506 of 2024*

**BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT**

WEB COPY

**DATED : 04.07.2025**

**CORAM:**

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

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G. ARUL MURUGAN**

**HABEAS CORPUS PETITION(MD)No. 1506 of 2024**

Gokul

... Petitioner

VS.


1. State Principal Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Fort St. George, Chennai -9.

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

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

... 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 with the detention order of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent in Detention Order No.96/2024, dated 10.10.2024 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Gokul, son of Rengarajan, aged about 24 years, now confining at Madurai Central Prison before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.



**HCP(MD)No.1506 of 2024**

For Petitioner : Mr.S. Ramesh Kumar

WEB COPY

For Respondents : Mr.S.Ravi  
Additional Public Prosecutor

## **ORDER**

[Order of the Court was made by **G. ARUL MURUGAN, J.**]

The petitioner is the detenu viz., Gokul, son of Rengarajan, aged about 24 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Detention Order No.96/2024, dated 10.10.2024, 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 detenu was not furnished with translated copy of the remand warrant at Page No.53, Volume I of the Booklet and the endorsement made in the said document is in English, which are not clear. Hence, it is submitted that



**HCP(MD)No.1506 of 2024**

the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

WEB COPY

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor fairly submitted that the translated copy of the remand warrant at Page No.53, Volume I of the Booklet was not furnished with the detenu and the endorsement made in the said document is also in English version.

5. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is found that the translated version of the document at Page No.53, Volume I of the Booklet has not been furnished to the detenu and the endorsement made in the said document is in English version, which are not clear. This furnishing illegible copies and non furnishing of translated copies of the vital documents 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, 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.1506 of 2024**

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 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.1506 of 2024**

...

*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 the translated copy of the Page No.53 Volume I of the Booklet has not been furnished to the detenu and the endorsement made in the said document is also in English version. 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.

7. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Detention Order No.96/2024, dated 10.10.2024, passed by the



**HCP(MD)No.1506 of 2024**

second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Gokul, son of Rengarajan, 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.]**

**[G.A.M., J.]**

**04.07.2025**

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

trp


To:

1. The Principal Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Fort St. George, Chennai -9.

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

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

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



WEB COPY



*HCP(MD)No.1506 of 2024*

**A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.**

**AND**

**G. ARUL MURUGAN, J.**

trp

**ORDER MADE IN**  
**HCP(MD)No.1506 of 2024**

**DATED : 04.07.2025**