



HCP.No.168 of 2025

WEB COPY

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.168 of 2025

RASIGA

... Petitioner/ wife of the detenue

Vs.

1. The Secretary To The Government,
Government Of Tamil Nadu,
Home Prohibition And Excise Department,
Fort St George, Chennai - 600 009.

2.The District Collector
District Magistrate, Cuddalore,
Cuddalore District.

3.The Superintendent Of Police,
Cuddalore, Cuddalore District.

4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Cuddalore

5.The Inspector Of Police,
Chiudambaram Taluk Police Station,
Cuddalore District
Cr.No.218 Of 2024.

... Respondents



HCP.No.168 of 2025

WEB CC

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records connected in C3/D.O.NO.103/2024, dated 14.12.2024 and quash the order of detention passed therein by the 2nd respondent herein against the detenue and directing the respondents herein to produce the body or person of the detenue by name Ragul @ Ragulsami, son of Marimuthu, aged about 28 years, detained at Central Prison, Cuddalore, before this Court and setting him at Liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner	: Mr.Ragul Kousik
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 wife of the detenu namely Ragul @ Ragulsami, son of Marimuthu, aged about 28 years, detained at Central Prison, Cuddalore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 14.12.2024 issued



HCP.No.168 of 2025


WEB COPY

against her son, 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.

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 arrest intimation order 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, this Court finds that the arrest intimation in page No.56 has not been properly translated. Therefore, this Court is of the view that the improper translation of the copy of the vital



HCP.No.168 of 2025

WEB COPY

document 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.168 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.168 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 14.12.2024 in C3/D.O.NO.103/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Ragul @ Ragulsami, son of Marimuthu, aged about 28 years, detained at Central Prison, Cuddalore, 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.168 of 2025

To
WEB COPY

1. The Secretary To The Government,
Government Of Tamil Nadu,
Home Prohibition And Excise Department,
Fort St George, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector
District Magistrate, Cuddalore,
Cuddalore District.
3. The Superintendent Of Police,
Cuddalore, Cuddalore District.
4. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Cuddalore
5. The Inspector Of Police,
Chiudambaram Taluk Police Station,
Cuddalore District
Cr.No.218 Of 2024.
6. The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.
7. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.168 of 2025

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

Anu

H.C.P.No.168 of 2025

21.04.2025