



HCP.No.509 of 2025

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 24.06.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.509 of 2025

Arumugam

... Petitioner/father of the detenue

Vs.

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

2.District Collector And District
Magistrate Of
Tiruvannamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.

3.The Superintendent Of Police
Tiruvannamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.

4.The Superintendent Of Prison
Central Prison, Vellore.

5.The Inspector Of Police
Kilpennathur Police Station,
Tiruvannamalai District.

... Respondents



HCP.No.509 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 in Connection with the order of Detention passed by the second respondent dated 25.02.2025 in D.O.No.05/2025-C2 against the petitioner's son Akash, aged 23 years, S/o.Arumugam, confined at Central Prison, Vellore and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenue before the Court and set him at Liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Balaji

For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor


ORDER

M.S.RAMESH, J.

AND

V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

The petitioner herein, who is the father of the detenu namely Akash, aged 23 years, S/o.Arumugam, confined at Central Prison, Vellore has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 25.02.2025 issued against his 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,



HCP.No.509 of 2025


Slum Grabbers and Video 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 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 bail dismissal order of the co-accused 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.282 and 283 of the booklet in Volume-II, a copy of the bail dismissal order of the co-accused is available and the translated copy in vernacular version of the same has not been furnished to the detenu. Therefore, the detenu is deprived from making effective representation and that the Detention Order passed by the Detaining Authority is vitiated.



HCP.No.509 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 effective representation against the order. But it would



WEB COPY




HCP.No.509 of 2025

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.

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 25.02.2025 in D.O.No.05/2025-C2, is hereby set



HCP.No.509 of 2025

WEB COPY

aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Akash, aged 23 years, S/o.Arumugam, confined at Central Prison, Vellore, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case.

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

24.06.2025

Index: Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Anu

To

1. The Secretary To The Government
Home Prohibition And Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
2. District Collector And District Magistrate Of
Tiruvannamalai District, Tiruvannamalai.
3. The Superintendent Of Police
Tiruvannamalai District, Tiruvannamalai.
4. The Superintendent Of Prison
Central Prison, Vellore.
5. The Inspector Of Police
Kilpennathur Police Station,
Tiruvannamalai District.
6. The Joint Secretary,



HCP.No.509 of 2025

Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.

7.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.509 of 2025

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

Anu

H.C.P.No.509 of 2025

24.06.2025