



WEB COPY



HCP.No.371 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 28.03.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH
AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

H.C.P.No.371 of 2025

Sivakami

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu
rep. by its Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St. George
Chennai-600 009

2.The Commissioner of Police / Detaining Authority
Tiruppur City
Tiruppur District

3.The Superintendent
Central Prison
Coimbatore District

4.The Inspector of Police
Veerapandi Police Station
Tiruppur City

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to



HCP.No.371 of 2025

WEB COPY

issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to produce the body of the detenu by name Gowtham, aged 20, S/o.Balasubramani, presently confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith, after calling for the records pertaining to the detention order dated 24.12.2024 made in C.No.103/G/IS/Tiruppur City/2024 passed by the 2nd respondent, Goonda act and quash the same.


For Petitioner : Mr.A.Saravanan

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 is the mother of the detenu viz., Gowtham, S/o.Balasubramani, aged about 20 years, confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 24.12.2024 slapped on her son, 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



HCP.No.371 of 2025

[Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].


WEB COPY

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 of Form 91 in Volume I 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 Form 91 in Page Nos.79 to 81 in Volume-I of the booklet furnished to the detenu, is illegible. This furnishing of illegible copies of the vital document would deprive the detenu from 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



HCP.No.371 of 2025

WEB COPY

'(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-



WEB COPY



HCP.No.371 of 2025

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 the second respondent on 24.12.2024 in C.No.103/G/IS/Tiruppur City/2024 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Gowtham, S/o.Balasubramani, aged about 20 years, confined at



HCP.No.371 of 2025

Central Prison, Coimbatore, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

WEB COPY

[M.S.R, J.]

[N.S, J.]

28.03.2025

kas

Index: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

To

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

2.The Commissioner of Police / Detaining Authority
Tiruppur City
Tiruppur District

3.The Superintendent
Central Prison
Coimbatore District

4.The Inspector of Police
Veerapandi Police Station
Tiruppur City

5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

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

kas



WEB COPY



HCP.No.371 of 2025

H.C.P.No.371 of 2025

28.03.2025