



WEB COPY



HCP.No.539 of 2025

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.539 of 2025

Palaniyammal

Petitioner(s) /mother of the detenue

Vs

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

2.The Commissioner Of Police,
Salem District, Salem.

3.The Superintendent Of Prison,
Central Prison, Salem District.

4.The Inspector Of Police,
Kitchipalayam Police Station, Salem
District.

...Respondent(s)

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



HCP.No.539 of 2025

issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records pertaining to the order of detention passed in C.M.P.No.6/Drug Offender/Salem City/2025 on 26.02.2025 passed by the 2nd respondent and set aside the same and directing the respondents to produce the petitioner's son by name in Karthick, son of Murugesan, aged about 26 years, before this Court now confined in Central Prison, Salem and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Deepakkumar

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, Karthick, son of Murugesan, aged about 26 years, confined in Central Prison, Salem, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 26.02.2025 issued against her son, 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 Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14



HCP.No.539 of 2025

of 1982].

WEB COPY

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and 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 arrest intimation, has not been properly translated. 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 page Nos.20 & 21, this Court finds the copy of the arrest intimation, which is reflected in both English and Tamil. However, the English and vernacular translation copies of the same have not been furnished separately to the detenu herein. 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 vitiated.

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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.539 of 2025

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.



HCP.No.539 of 2025

WEB COPY

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 26.02.2025 in C.M.P.No.6/Drug Offender/Salem City/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Karthick, son of Murugesan, aged about 26 years, confined in Central Prison, Salem, 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
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Internet: Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
Anu

To

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

Page 6 of 8



HCP.No.539 of 2025

WEB COPY

2.The Commissioner Of Police,
Salem District, Salem.

3.The Superintendent Of Prison,
Central Prison, Salem District.

4.The Inspector Of Police,
Kitchipalayam Police Station, Salem
District.

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

6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.539 of 2025

H.C.P.No.539 of 2025

24.06.2025