



WEB COPY



HCP.No.94 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.94 of 2025

N.Dhandapani

... Petitioner/ father of the detenue

Vs.

1. The Additional Chief Secretry To Government
Home, Prohibition And Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009

2.The Commissioner Of Police
Greater Chennai Office Of Commissioner Of Police
Goondas Section Vepery, Chennai 600 007

3.The Superintendent Of Prison
Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai 600 066

4.The Inspector Of Police
Law And Order
R-11 Ramapuram Police Station,
Bharathi Salai, Ramapuram,
Chennai 600 083

... Respondents

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



HCP.No.94 of 2025

WEB COPY


No.1254/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 16.12.2024 on the file of the 2nd respondent and to quash the same, and to consequently direct the respondents to produce the person body of petitioner's son namely Karthikeyan, son of N.Dhandapani, aged 24 years, the detenu herein, now confined at Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.Gopika Nambiar
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 father of the detenu namely Karthikeyan, son of N.Dhandapani, aged 24 years, confined at Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 16.12.2024 issued against his son, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber



HCP.No.94 of 2025

WEB COPY

Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Sexual Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].

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

3. Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the order of Detention passed by the Detaining Authority is vitiated for material irregularities, as the copy of the memo of evidence has not been properly translated in Tamil. It is therefore stated that the detenu is deprived of his valuable right to make effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet in Volume-II, particularly, in page Nos.37 and 43, this Court finds that the copies of the memo of evidence are placed in both English and Tamil. However, the English version has not been fully translated to its vernacular version. Therefore, this Court is of the view that the improper translation of the copy of the vital document



HCP.No.94 of 2025

WEB COPY

relied upon by the Detaining Authority to arrive at a subjective satisfaction, would deprive the detenu of his valuable right to make effective representation. It is in the said circumstances, this Court finds that the Detention Order passed by the Detaining Authority is vitiated.

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




WEB COPY



HCP.No.94 of 2025

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.”*



HCP.No.94 of 2025

WEB COPY

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.

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 16.12.2024 in Memo No.1254/BCDFGISSSV/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Karthikeyan, son of N.Dhandapani, aged 24 years, confined at Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai, 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

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Internet: Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
Anu



HCP.No.94 of 2025

WEB COPY

- To
1. The Additional Chief Secretary To Government
Home, Prohibition And Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009
 2. The Commissioner Of Police
Greater Chennai Office Of Commissioner Of Police
Goondas Section Vepery, Chennai 600 007
 3. The Superintendent Of Prison
Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai 600 066
 4. The Inspector Of Police
Law And Order
R-11 Ramapuram Police Station,
Bharathi Salai, Ramapuram,
Chennai 600 083
 5. The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.
 6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.94 of 2025

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

Anu

H.C.P.No.94 of 2025

21.04.2025