



WEB COPY

HCP No. 254 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 07-04-2025

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR**

HCP No. 254 of 2025

BANU

W/o.Mohamad Rafique, No.51/123-3rd
Street, Annai Sathiya Nagar, Ioc,
Thandaiyarpettai, Chennai.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

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

2.The Commissioner Of Police,
Coimbatore City, Coimbatore.

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



4.The State Rep By,
The Inspector Of Police,
Cyber Crime Police Station,
Coimbatore District.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

To issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus or any other Writ or Order in the nature of Writ call for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the 2nd respondent dated 18.12.2024 in C.No.130/G/IS/2024 against the petitioner husband M.Mohamad Rafique, M/53 Years, S/o.Mohamad Meeran, who is confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore and set aside the same and consequently direct the respondents to produce the detenu before the Honble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. A.Saranraj

For Respondent(s): Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan
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 viz., M.Mohamad Ragique S/o.Mohamad Meeran, aged about 53 years, confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 18.12.2024 slapped on her husband, branding him as "Cyber Law Offender" 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 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 Remand Order was not properly translated to Tamil version. 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.66 in Volume-I of the booklet furnished to the detenu, was not properly translated to Tamil version. Therefore, the detenue is deprived from making effective representation and 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 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.”

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 18.12.2024 in C.No.130/G/IS/2024 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., M.Mohamad Rafique S/o.Mohamad Meeran, aged about 53 years, confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

(M.S.RAMESH J.) (N.SENTHILKUMAR J.)

07-04-2025

ASI

Index:Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet:Yes

Neutral Citation:Yes/No



To
WEB COPY

1. The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition And Excise
Department, Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
2. The Commissioner Of Police,
Coimbatore City, Coimbatore.
3. The Superintendent Of Prison,
Central Prison, Coimbatore.
4. The Inspector Of Police,
Cyber Crime Police Station,
Coimbatore District.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras, Chennai.



WEB COPY

HCP No. 254 of 2025



M.S.RAMESH J.
AND
N.SENTHILKUMAR J.

ASI

HCP No. 254 of 2025

07-04-2025