



HCP.No.471 of 2025

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 25.04.2025

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.471 of 2025

Santhanalakshmi

... Petitioner/ sister of the detenue

Vs.

1. The State Of Tamilnadu Rep By,
The Secretary To Government,
Home, Prohibition And Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.

2.The District Magistrate And District Collector,
Cuddalore District, Cuddalore.


3.The Superintendent Of Police,
Cuddalore District.

4.The Superintendent Of Prison,
Central Prison, Cuddalore.

5.The Inspector Of Police,
Ramanathan Police Station,
Cuddalore District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to
issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records pertaining to the



HCP.No.471 of 2025

WEB COPY

order of detention passed by the 2nd respondent in C3/D.O.No.96/2024 dated 11.11.2024 against the petitioner's brother Manivannan, S/o.Ponmudi, aged about 23 years, now confined at Central Prison, Cuddalore and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Honble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Suryakumaran

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 sister of the detenu namely Manivannan, S/o.Ponmudi, aged about 23 years, now confined at Central Prison, Cuddalore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 11.11.2024 issued against her brother, 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 Offenders, Sexual Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video



HCP.No.471 of 2025


Pirates Act, 1982 [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 grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the order of Detention passed by the Detaining Authority is vitiated for material irregularities, as the copy of the remand extension order has not been properly translated in Tamil. It is therefore stated that the detenu is deprived of his valuable right to make effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, particularly, in page Nos.107 and 109, this Court finds that the copies of the remand extension orders, which have not been properly translated and the English entries have not been translated to its vernacular version. Therefore, this Court is of the view that the improper translation of the copy of the vital document relied upon by the Detaining Authority to arrive at a subjective satisfaction, would deprive the detenu of his valuable right to make effective representation.



HCP.No.471 of 2025

WEB COPY

It is in the said circumstances, this Court finds 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.”*

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



HCP.No.471 of 2025

order is liable to be quashed.
WEB COPY

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 11.11.2024 in C3/D.O.No.96/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Manivannan, S/o.Ponmudi, aged about 23 years, now confined at Central Prison, Cuddalore, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case.

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

25.04.2025

(1/3)

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, Fort St.George, Chennai-600
009.

2.The District Magistrate And District Collector,
Cuddalore District, Cuddalore.



HCP.No.471 of 2025

3.The Superintendent Of Police,
Cuddalore District.

4.The Superintendent Of Prison,
Central Prison, Cuddalore.

5.The Inspector Of Police,
Ramanathan Police Station, Cuddalore District.

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

7.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.471 of 2025

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

Anu

H.C.P.No.471 of 2025

25.04.2025
(1/3)