



HCP.No.247 of 2025

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 06.06.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.247 of 2025

KATHIRAMMAL

... Petitioner/ mother of the detainee

Vs.

1. The State Rep By,
The Secretary To Government,
Home, Prohibition And Excise
Department, Secretariat, Chennai-
600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner Of Police/
Detaining Authority, Tiruppur City.
- 3.The Superintendent Of Prison,
Central Prison, Coimbatore.
- 4.The Inspector Of Police,
South Police Station, Tiruppur City,
Tiruppur.

... Respondents



HCP.No.247 of 2025

WEB COPY

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records in C.No.01/D.O.IS/Tiruppur City/2025 passed by the second respondent on 13.01.2025 and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenue Rajamanickam, Son of Mallan, aged 39 years, detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Prabhu

For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public prosecutor

ORDER

M.S.RAMESH, J.

AND

V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

The petitioner herein, who is the mother of the detenu namely Rajamanickam, Son of Mallan, aged 39 years, detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 13.01.2025 issued against her son, branding him as "Drug Offender" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand



HCP.No.247 of 2025

Offenders, Sexual Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982

WEB COPY


[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 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 the booklet. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

4. On a perusal of Volume I of the Booklet, it is seen that Page No.41 in the booklet furnished to the detenue, 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



HCP.No.247 of 2025

WEB COPY

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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.247 of 2025

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.

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by



HCP.No.247 of 2025

WEB COPY

the second respondent on 13.01.2025 in C.No.01/D.O.IS/Tiruppur City/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed.

The detenu viz., Rajamanickam, Son of Mallan, aged 39 years, detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R., J] [V.L.N., J]

06.06.2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Anu


To

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

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

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

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



HCP.No.247 of 2025

Tiruppur.

WEB COPY

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

6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.247 of 2025

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

Anu

H.C.P.No.247 of 2025

06.06.2025