



WEB COPY



HCP.No.641 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.06.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.641 of 2025

Nivetha

Petitioner(s) /wife of the detainee


Vs

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

2.The District Collector and District
Magistrate
Tiruvannamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.

3.The Superintendent of Police
Tiruvannamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.

4.The Inspector of Police
Prohibition Enforcement Wing,
Tiruvannamalai.



HCP.No.641 of 2025

5.The Superintendent
Central Prison, Salem.

WEB COPY

...Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the entire records, relating to Petitioners husband detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order, dated 14.03.2025 on the file of the second respondent herein made in proceedings D.O.No.11/2025-C2 and quash the same as illegal and consequently, direct the respondents herein to produce the said petitioner's husband namely Murugan @ Puyal Murugan, aged 33 years, son of Vijayan, before this Court and set him at liberty, now Petitioner's son detained at Central prison, Salem.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.C.Chellappan

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

ORDER

M.S.RAMESH, J.

and

V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

The petitioner herein, who is the wife of the detenu, Murugan @ Puyal Murugan, aged 33 years, son of Vijayan, who is confined at Central



HCP.No.641 of 2025

Prison, Salem, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 14.03.2025 issued against her husband, 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 of 1982].

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 forensic examination report, has not been properly translated. It is therefore stated that the detenu is deprived of his valuable right to make effective representation.



WEB COPY

4. On a perusal of the Booklet in Volume-I, particularly in page Nos.31 and 32, this Court finds a copy of the forensic examination report in both Tamil and English. However, some portion of the English version has 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. 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:



WEB COPY



HCP.No.641 of 2025

“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,



WEB COPY



HCP.No.641 of 2025


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 14.03.2025 in D.O.No.11/2025-C2, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Murugan @ Puyal Murugan, aged 33 years, son of Vijayan, who is confined at 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]
27.06.2025

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



HCP.No.641 of 2025

To

WEB COPY

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

2.The District Collector and District
Magistrate
Tiruvannamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.

3.The Superintendent of Police
Tiruvannamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.

4.The Inspector of Police
Prohibition Enforcement Wing,
Tiruvannamalai.

5.The Superintendent
Central Prison, Salem.

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

7.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.641 of 2025

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

H.C.P.No.641 of 2025

27.06.2025