



H.C.P.(MD)No.642 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED :08.01.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN

AND

THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R. POORNIMA

H.C.P.(MD)No.642 of 2025

Jothilakshmi

... Petitioner

-VS-

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

2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Theni District, Theni.

3.The Inspector of Police,
Thevaram Police Station,
Theni District.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Special Prison for Women,
Madurai.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India
praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating



H.C.P.(MD)No.642 of 2025

to the detention order passed by the second respondent in Detention Order No.19/2025 dated 24.05.2025 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu Dhanalakshmi @ Manjula, wife of Alagarsamy, female, aged about 38 years, who is detained at Special Prison for Women, Madurai before this Court and set her at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Mariappan
For Respondents : Mr.T.Senthil Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by **G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN,J.**)

The petitioner is the daughter of the detenu viz., Dhanalakshmi @ Manjula, wife of Alagarsamy, aged about 38 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Detention Order No.19/2025, dated 24.05.2025, 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



H.C.P.(MD)No.642 of 2025

respondents. We have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner raised the ground that the petitioner was served with illegible copy of the remand report in English, which is annexed in Page No.29 of Volume-I of the booklet. Though the petitioner was served with translated copy of the remand report, the detaining authority failed to serve the clean copy of the remand report to the detenu. It is, therefore, stated that the detenu is deprived of his valuable right to make an effective representation to the authorities concerned to reconsider the detention order.

4. 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.642 of 2025

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 the order. But it would not be so where the document merely finds a reference



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.642 of 2025

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."

5. 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 remand report has impaired her constitutional right to make



H.C.P.(MD)No.642 of 2025

WEB COPY

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.

6. In fine, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detention order passed in Detention Order No.19/2025, dated 24.05.2025, by the 2nd respondent, is set aside. Consequently, the detenu viz., Dhanalakshmi @ Manjula, W/o.Alagarsamy, aged about 38 years, who is now detained in Special Prison for Women, Madurai, is directed to be released forthwith, unless her presence or custody or detention is required in connection with any other case.

[G.K.I., J.] [R.P., J.]

08.01.2026

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



H.C.P.(MD)No.642 of 2025

WEB COPY To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Theni District, Theni.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
Thevaram Police Station,
Theni District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Special Prison for Women,
Madurai.
- 5.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.642 of 2025

G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN,J.
AND
R. POORNIMA,J.

am

H.C.P.(MD)No.642 of 2025

08.01.2026