



H.C.P.(MD)No.1416 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 25.02.2026

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN
AND
THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R. POORNIMA**

H.C.P.(MD)No.1416 of 2025

Meena

... Petitioner

-VS-

State of Tamil Nadu Rep. by

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.

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

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Trichy

4. The Inspector of Police
Thirugokarnam Police Station,
Thirugokarnam
Pudukottai District

... 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
to the detention order passed by the second respondent in detention order



H.C.P.(MD)No.1416 of 2025

on 09.08.2025 in detention Order in P.D.O.No.26 of 2025 and to quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body of the detenue namely Boopathi, S/o.Ayyappan, aged about 30 years before this Court and set him at liberty now detained at Central Prison, Trichy

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Ramesh Kumar

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 mother of the detenu viz., Boopathi, S/o.Ayyappan, aged about 30 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in P.D.O.No.26 of 2025 dated 09.08.2025 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.1416 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 detenu, 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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.1416 of 2025

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 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 page nos. 14,22 to 25 of the booklet has impaired his



H.C.P.(MD)No.1416 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 P.D.O.No.26 of 2025 dated 09.08.2025, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Boopathi, S/o.Ayyappan, aged about 30 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[G.K.I., J.] [R.P., J.]
25.02.2026

NCC :Yes/No
Index: Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
aav



H.C.P.(MD)No.1416 of 2025

WEB COPY

To

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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.1416 of 2025

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

aav

H.C.P.(MD)No.1416 of 2025

25.02.2026