



HCP.No.576 of 2025

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 13.06.2025

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.576 of 2025

D.Sathya Bama

... Petitioner/ mother of the detenue

Vs.

1. Government Of Tamil Nadu Rep
By Its
Additional Chief Secretary,
Secretary, Home Prohibition And
Excise Department, Secretariat,
Chennai 600 009

2.The Commissioner Of Police
Detaining Authority,
Coimbatore City.

3.The Superintendent Of Prison
Central Prison,
Coimbatore District

4.The Inspector Of Police
Podhanur Police Station,
Coimbatore District

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to
issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records in Detention order



HCP.No.576 of 2025

passed in C.NO.12/G/IS/2025 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondent herein to produce the petitioner's son of detenu Thiru D.Akash Kumar, S/o.Dhanasekar, aged 25 years, now confined in Central Prison, Coimbatore, before this court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Padmanabhan

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

ORDER

M.S.RAMESH, J.

AND

V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

The petitioner herein, who is the mother of the detenu namely D.Akash Kumar, S/o.Dhanasekar, aged 25 years, now confined in Central Prison, Coimbatore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 06.02.2025 issued against 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 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned



HCP.No.576 of 2025

Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

WEB COPY

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 Judicial Form-14 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 in Volume-I, particularly, in page Nos.124 and 125, this Court finds that the copies of the Judicial Form-14 were placed in both English and Tamil. However, some facts in the Tamil translated copy differs from the English version, specifically, the date mentioned above the signature of the learned Judicial Magistrate. 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. It is in the said circumstances, this Court finds that the Detention Order passed by the Detaining Authority is



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



WEB COPY




HCP.No.576 of 2025

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.

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the



HCP.No.576 of 2025

second respondent on 06.02.2025 in C.NO.12/G/IS/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., D.Akash Kumar, S/o.Dhanasekar, aged 25 years, now confined in Central Prison, Coimbatore, 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]

13.06.2025

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Internet: Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
Anu

To

1.The Additional Chief Secretary,
Secretary, Home Prohibition And
Excise Department, Secretariat,
Chennai 600 009

2.The Commissioner Of Police
Detaining Authority, Coimbatore
City.

3.The Superintendent Of Prison
Central Prison, Coimbatore District

4.The Inspector Of Police
Podhanur Police Station,
Coimbatore District



HCP.No.576 of 2025

WEB COPY

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

6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.576 of 2025

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

Anu

H.C.P.No.576 of 2025

13.06.2025