



WEB COPY



HCP.No.227 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 05.03.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

H.C.P.No.227 of 2025

R.Muniyappan

Petitioner(s) /brother of the detenue

Vs

1. The Secretary To The Government,
Home, Prohibition And Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.

2.The Commissioner Of Police,
Greater Chennai.

3.The Superintendent Of Prison,
Central Prison, Vellore.

4.The Inspector Of Police,
K-3, Aminjikarai Police Station,
Greater Chennai.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, call for the records in connection with the order in Detention passed by the second respondent 09.05.2024 in No.484/BCDFGISSSV/2024 against the petitioner's Brother Karthik @ Loosu Karthik, Male, aged 29 years, S/o.Ravi who is confined at Central



HCP.No.227 of 2025

Prison, Vellore and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before the Court and set him at liberty.

WEB COPY

For Petitioner	: Mr.D.Balaji
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 brother of the detenu, Karthik @ Loosu Karthik, Male, aged 29 years, S/o.Ravi, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 09.05.2024 slapped on his brother, 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.



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 furnished with illegible copies in volume-II of the booklet. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that Page No.42 in Volume-II of the booklet furnished to the detenu, is illegible. This furnishing of illegible copies 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 '*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:

WEB COPY

“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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.227 of 2025

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. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 09.05.2024 in No.484/BCDFGISSSV/2024 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Karthik @ Loosu Karthik, Male, aged 29 years, S/o.Ravi, 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]
05.03.2025

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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.227 of 2025

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

To

1. The Secretary To The Government,
Home, Prohibition And Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.

2. The Commissioner Of Police,
Greater Chennai.

3. The Superintendent Of Prison,
Central Prison, Vellore.

4. The Inspector Of Police,
K-3, Aminjikarai Police Station,
Greater Chennai.

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

6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.227 of 2025

05.03.2025