



WEB COPY



HCP.No.20 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21.04.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

H.C.P.No.20 of 2025

POONGODI

... Petitioner/ mother of the detenue

Vs.

1. Government Of Tamil Nadu Rep.By Its
Additional Chief Secretary, Home, Prohibition
And Excise Department, Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.

2.The District Collector And
District Magistrate, Vellore District, Vellore.


3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Vellore.

4.The Superintendent Of Police,
Vellore District, Vellore.

5.Inspector Of Police,
Vellore - All Women Police Station,
Vellore District.

... Respondents

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



HCP.No.20 of 2025


C3/D.O.No.107/2024 dated 10.12.2024 on the file of the 2nd Respondent and quash the same and direct the Respondents herein to produce the body of the detenu Chinnarasu, M/29 years, son of Sekar, now confined in Central Prison, Vellore before this Court and set him at Liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Thirumoorthy
For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public prosecutor
assisted by Mr.M.Sylvester John

ORDER

M.S.RAMESH, J.
AND
N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

The petitioner herein, who is the mother of the detenu namely Chinnarasu, aged 29 years, son of Sekar, confined in Central Prison, Vellore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 10.12.2024 slapped on her son, branding him as "Sexual Offender" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Sexual Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982



HCP.No.20 of 2025


[Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].

WEB COPY

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

3. Though the learned counsel for the petitioner has raised several other grounds to assail the order of detention, he has mainly focused his argument on the ground that the dismissal of the bail order has not been translated in its Vernacular language. This deprived the detenu from making effective representation. Therefore, on the sole ground, the detention order is liable to be quashed.

4. On perusal of the documents available on record, particularly from Page Nos.62 to 64 of the booklet, this Court finds that the copy of the bail dismissal order, which has not been translated in its vernacular version. Therefore, the detenu is deprived from making effective representation and that the Detention Order passed by the Detaining Authority is vitiated.



HCP.No.20 of 2025

WEB COPY

5. In this context, it is useful to refer to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**Powanammal Vs. State of Tamil Nadu**' reported in '**(1999) 2 SCC 413**'. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, after discussing the safeguards embodied in Article 22[5] of the Constitution, observed that the detenu should be afforded an opportunity of making 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. In the said context, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held in Paragraphs 9 and 16 {as in SCC journal} as follows:


“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 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. In view of the ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and in view of the aforesaid facts, this Court is of the view that the detention order is liable to be quashed.



HCP.No.20 of 2025

WEB COPY

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 10.12.2024 in C3/D.O.No.107/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Chinnarasu, aged 29 years, son of Sekar, confined in Central Prison, Vellore, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R., J]

[N.S., J]

21.04.2025

(1/3)

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Anu

To

1.The Additional Chief Secretary, Home,
Prohibition And Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.

2.The District Collector And
District Magistrate, Vellore District, Vellore.

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Vellore.



HCP.No.20 of 2025

4.The Superintendent Of Police,
Vellore District, Vellore.

5.Inspector Of Police,
Vellore - All Women Police Station,
Vellore District.

6.The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.

7.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.20 of 2025

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

Anu

H.C.P.No.20 of 2025

21.04.2025
(1/3)