



HCP.No.304 of 2025

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 17.03.2025

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.304 of 2025

Kanagavalli

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Principal Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009

2.The District Magistrate
And District Collector
Tiruppur District
Tiruppur

3.The Superintendent of Police
Tiruppur District

4.The Superintendent
Central Prison
Coimbatore

5.The Inspector of Police
Palladam Police Station
Tiruppur District

... Respondents



HCP.No.304 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 relating to the detention order passed by the second respondent pertaining to the order in Cr.M.P.No.100/GOONDA/2024 dated 22.11.2024 in detaining the detenu under 2(f) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982, as a GOONDA and quash the same and direct the respondent to produce the detenu P.Esakkimuthu, Son of Ponnusamy aged about 41 years, who is detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore, before this Court and set him at liberty.


For Petitioner : Mr.G.Nirmal Krishnan

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 viz. P.Esakkimuthu, S/o.Ponnusamy, aged about 41 years, detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 22.11.2024 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,



HCP.No.304 of 2025


WEB COPY

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 the learned counsel for the petitioner has raised several other grounds to assail the order of detention, he has mainly focused his argument on the ground that the Government Order in G.O.(D).No.297, Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department, dated 14.10.2024 has not been translated in vernacular language. This deprived the detenu from making effective representation. Therefore, on the sole ground, the detention order is liable to be quashed.

4. On perusal of the documents available on record, particularly in Page Nos.297 and 298 of the booklet, a copy of the Government Order in G.O.(D).No.297, Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department, dated 14.10.2024 is available and the translated copy in vernacular version of the same has not been furnished to the detenu. Therefore, the detenu is



HCP.No.304 of 2025

WEB COPY

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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.304 of 2025

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.”*

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.



HCP.No.304 of 2025

WEB COPY

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 22.11.2024 in Cr.M.P.No.100/GOONDA/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., P.Esakkimuthu, S/o.Ponnusamy, aged 41 years, detained 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.R, J.]

[N.S, J.]

17.03.2025

kas


Index: Yes/No
Neutral Citation

kas

To

1.The Principal Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009

2.The District Magistrate
And District Collector
Tiruppur District



HCP.No.304 of 2025

Tiruppur

WEB COPY

3.The Superintendent of Police
Tiruppur District

4.The Superintendent
Central Prison
Coimbatore

5.The Inspector of Police
Palladam Police Station
Tiruppur District

6.The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras
Chennai 600 104



WEB COPY



HCP.No.304 of 2025

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

kas

H.C.P.No.304 of 2025

17.03.2025