



H.C.P(MD)No.1538 of 2024

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 07.07.2025

CORAM:

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


H.C.P(MD)No.1538 of 2024

Meenakshisundaram

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tirunelveli District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli District.



H.C.P(MD)No.1538 of 2024

4.The Inspector of Police,
Cheranmahadevi Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records relating to the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent in M.H.S.Confdl. No.161/2024 dated 22.09.2024 and to quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the person or body of the detenu namely, Aathi Ganesh, aged about 23 years, S/o.Meenakshisundaram, before this Court and set him at liberty, now detained at Central Prison, Palayamkottai.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Saravanakumar


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 father of the detenu viz., Aathi Ganesh, aged about 23 years, S/o.Meenakshisundaram. The detenu has been



H.C.P(MD)No.1538 of 2024


WEB COPY

detained by the second respondent by his order in M.H.S.Confdl.No. 161/2024 dated 22.09.2024 holding him to be a "Drug Offender", as contemplated under Section 2(e) 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 furnished with illegible copy of the Remand Order relied on by the Detaining Authority, more particularly at Page No.65 of the booklet. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

4. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents strongly opposed the Habeas Corpus Petition by filing his




H.C.P(MD)No.1538 of 2024

WEB COPY

counter. He would further submit that furnishing of illegible copy of remand order documents relied on by the Detaining Authority to the detenu, will not cause any prejudice to the detenu and on that score alone, it cannot be quashed. Therefore prays for dismissal of the Habeas Corpus Petition.

5. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that Page No.65 of the Booklet, which is the Remand Order, furnished to the detenu, is illegible. 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.

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 material in the language which



H.C.P(MD)No.1538 of 2024

WEB COPY

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.

...

...

16. For the above reasons, in our view, the



WEB COPY




H.C.P(MD)No.1538 of 2024

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 non-furnishing of legible copy of the document relied on by the Detaining Authority at Page No.65 of the Booklet. This furnishing of illegible 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.

8. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in M.H.S.Confdl.No.161/2024 dated 22.09.2024 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz.,Aathi Ganesh, aged about 23 years, S/o.Meenakshisundaram, is directed to be released



H.C.P(MD)No.1538 of 2024

forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

WEB COPY

[A.D.J.C., J.] [R.P., J.]
07.07.2025

Index : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No
rm

To:

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tirunelveli District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai, Tirunelveli District.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
Cheranmahadevi Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
- 5.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

Page No.7 of 8



WEB COPY



H.C.P(MD)No.1538 of 2024

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

rm

ORDER MADE IN
H.C.P(MD)No.1538 of 2024

DATED : 07.07.2025