



HCP.No.392 of 2025

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 01.04.2025

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.392 of 2025

Jango

... Petitioner/
Brother of the Detenu

Vs.

1. The State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai Police,
Tamil Nadu.
3. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Superintendent of Prisons,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Tamil Nadu.
4. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
G-7, Chetpet Police Station,
Chennai, Tamil Nadu.

... Respondents



HCP.No.392 of 2025

WEB COPY

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records of pertaining to the order of detention dated 11.12.2024 passed by the second respondent in TPDA : 6630 in Memo No.1217/BCDFGISSSV/2024 and quash the same and produce the detenu, Tarzan, son of Anthonydass, male aged about 29 years, who is detained in Central prison, Puzhal before this Honble court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Krishen

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyaparaj
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 viz., Tarzan, S/o.Anthonydoss aged about 29 years, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 11.12.2024 slapped on his brother, branding him as "Drug Offender" under the Tamil Nadu



HCP.No.392 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 detenu was furnished with illegible copy in 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.9 in Volume-II in the booklet furnished to the detenu, is illegible. This furnishing of illegible copy of the vital document would deprive the detenu of making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention.



HCP.No.392 of 2025

WEB COPY

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



WEB COPY




HCP.No.392 of 2025

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.392 of 2025

WEB COPY

7. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 11.12.2024 in No.1217/BCDFGISSSV/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Tarzan aged 29 years, S/o. Anthonydoss, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, 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.]

01.04.2025

ASI

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai Police,
Tamil Nadu.
3. The Superintendent of Prisons,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Tamil Nadu.



HCP.No.392 of 2025

WEB COPY

4. The Inspector of Police,
G-7, Chetpet Police Station,
Chennai, Tamil Nadu.
5. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.392 of 2025

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

ASI

H.C.P.No.392 of 2025

01.04.2025