



HCP.No.761 of 2025

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 26.06.2025

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.761 of 2025

Santhosh Kumari

... Petitioner

Vs.

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

2.The District Magistrate and District Collector
Thiruvarur District

3.The Superintendent
Thiruvarur District

4.The Superintendent
Central Prison, Trichy

5.STATE rep. by the Inspector of Police
Thiruthuraipoondi Police Station
Thiruvarur District
(Crime No.108 of 2025)

... Respondents



HCP.No.761 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 entire records leading to the detention of petitioner's husband, the detenu Amar Ram Prohith, aged 28 years, S/o.Ragunathaji, 242/4, Hospital Street, Thiruthuraipondi Police Station, Thiruvarur District presently detained in Central Prison, Trichy, under Act 14/1982, banded as Drug Offender vide the detention order dated 10.03.2025 in C.O.C.No.07/ Drug Offender/ on the file of the 2nd respondent herein, directing to produce the person of the detenu Amar Ram Prohith, aged 28 year, Son of Ragunathaji, before this Court and thereafter set him at liberty from the Central Prison, Trichy by set aside the above order.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Vasudevan

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein is the wife of the detenu viz. Amar Ram Prohith, S/o.Ragunathaji, aged about 28 years, confined at Central prison, Tiruchirappalli, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 10.03.2025 slapped on her husband, branding him as "Drug Offender" under the Tamil Nadu



HCP.No.761 of 2025


WEB COPY

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 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 copies 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 in Volume I, Page No.41 of the booklet, Remand Report, furnished to the detenu, is illegible. This furnishing of illegible copies of the vital document would deprive the detenu of making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention.



HCP.No.761 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.761 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



HCP.No.761 of 2025

WEB COPY

the second respondent on 10.03.2025 in C.O.C.No.07/2025 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz. Amar Ram Prohith, S/o.Ragunathaji, aged about 28 years, confined at Central prison, Tiruchirappalli, 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.]

26.06.2025

kas

Index: Yes/No

Neutral Citation


Speaking / Non speaking

To

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

2.The District Magistrate and District Collector
Thiruvarur District

3.The Superintendent
Thiruvarur District



HCP.No.761 of 2025

4.The Superintendent
Central Prison, Trichy

5.The Inspector of Police
Thiruthuraipoondi Police Station
Thiruvarur District
(Crime No.108 of 2025)

6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras,
Chennai 600 104



WEB COPY



HCP.No.761 of 2025

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

kas

H.C.P.No.761 of 2025

26.06.2025