



HCP(MD)No.557 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 30.06.2026

CORAM:

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

HABEAS CORPUS PETITION(MD)No.557 of 2026

Arilda

... Petitioner

vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu, Represented by its
Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai - 600 009.

2. The District Collector/District Magistrate,
Thoothukudi District,
Thoothukudi.

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

4. The Inspector of Police,
Thoothukudi North Police Station,
Thoothukudi District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent in Detention Order in No.H.S.(M).confdl.No.1/2026 dated 09.01.2026 and quash the same



HCP(MD)No.557 of 2026

and direct the respondents to produce the detenue Maria Antony Pitchaiah Titus @ Titus son of Rosary, male aged 28 years who is detained at Central Prison, Palayamkottai before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Muniyandi

For Respondents: Mr.G.Karuppaamy Pandiyan, Counsel for State of Tamilnadu(Crl.Side)

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by **A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.**]

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu viz., Mariya Anthony Pitchaiah Titus @ Titus, son of Rosary, aged 28 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in H.S(M)Confdl No.01/2026 dated 09.01.2026, 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 Counsel for State of Tamilnadu(Crl.Side) appearing for the respondents. We have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.




HCP(MD)No.557 of 2026

3. Though several grounds have been raised in the Habeas Corpus Petition, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the Detaining Authority, while detaining the detenu, has relied on the remand extension order, but the same has not been furnished to the detenu. It is, therefore, stated that the detenu is deprived of his valuable right to make an effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, this Court finds that the remand extension order relied on by the Detaining Authority has not been furnished to the detenu. Therefore, we are of the view that the non-furnishing of the said document would deprive the detenu of his valuable right to make an effective representation. It is in the said circumstances, this Court finds that the impugned detention order passed by the Detaining Authority is vitiated.

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



HCP(MD)No.557 of 2026

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:

"6. The short question that falls for our consideration is whether failure to supply the Tamil version of the order of remand passed in English, a language not known to the detenue, would vitiate her further detention.

...

...

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



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.557 of 2026


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 non supply 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 the remand extension order relied on by the Detaining Authority to the detenu, has impaired his constitutional right to make an effective



HCP(MD)No.557 of 2026

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 No.H.S.(M)Confdl.No.1/2026 dated 09.01.2026 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, Mariya Anthony Pitchaiah Titus @ Titus, Son of Rosary, aged about 28 years, is directed to be released forthwith, unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[A.D.J.C., J.] [R.P., J.]
30.06.2026

Index : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No
bala

To:

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,



HCP(MD)No.557 of 2026

Fort St. George, Chennai - 600 009.

WEB COPY

2. The District Collector/District Magistrate,
Thoothukudi District,
Thoothukudi.

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

4. The Inspector of Police,
Thoothukudi North Police Station,
Thoothukudi District.

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



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.557 of 2026

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

bala

ORDER MADE IN
HCP(MD)No.557 of 2026
DATED : 30.06.2026