



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.116 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 10.03.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N. SENTHILKUMAR

H.C.P.No.116 of 2025

Selvi

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu rep. by its,
Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.


2.The Commissioner of Police/Detaining Authority,
Tiruppur City, Tiruppur.

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

4.The Inspector of Police,
Tiruppur South Police Station,
Tiruppur City.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records pertaining to the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent in C.No.97/G/IS/Tiruppur



H.C.P.No.116 of 2025

City/2024 dated 09.12.2024 and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's husband namely Manikandan, S/o.Ramadas, aged 35 years, who is now confined in Central Prison, Coimbatore, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Vijaya Ragavan


For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj,
Additional Public Prosecutor
assisted by Mr.M.Sylvester John

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by *M.S. RAMESH, J.*)

The petitioner herein, who is the wife of the detenu namely Manikandan, aged about 35 years, S/o.Ramadas, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 09.12.2024 slapped on her husband, branding him as "Goonda" 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 [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.



H.C.P.No.116 of 2025

WEB COPY

3. Though several points have been raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner, it is stated that the detention order is liable to be quashed on the ground that the detenu was not furnished with translated copy of the remand report in vernacular language. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that a copy of the remand report is in Tamil and its translated copy in vernacular language (English) has not been furnished to the detenu. This non-furnishing of the copy of the vital document would deprive the detenu of making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention.

5. In this context, it is useful to refer to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of '*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



H.C.P.No.116 of 2025

WEB COPY

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.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.116 of 2025

..... **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.

7. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 09.12.2024 in C.No.97/G/IS/Tiruppur City/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Manikandan, aged about 35 years, S/o.Ramadas, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R, J.]

[N.S, J.]

10.03.2025

Index: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Sni



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.116 of 2025

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

Sni

To

1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police/Detaining Authority,
Tiruppur City, Tiruppur.

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

4.The Inspector of Police,
Tiruppur South Police Station, Tiruppur City.

5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

6.The Joint Secretary, Public (Law & Order),
Chennai – 600 009.

H.C.P.No.116 of 2025

10.03.2025