



HCP.No.661 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.661 of 2025

MAITHILI

... Petitioner/ wife of the detenue


*Vs.*

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

2.The District Collector And District  
Magistrate,  
Office of the District Collector,  
Mayiladuthurai.

3.The Superintendent Of Police,  
Office of the Superintendent of  
Police, Mayiladuthurai.

4.The Superintendent,  
Office of the Central Prison,  
Cuddalore.



HCP.No.661 of 2025

WEB COPY

5.The Inspector Of Police,  
Vaitheeswaran Koil Police Station,  
Sirkazhi Taluk, Mayiladuthurai.

... Respondents

**PRAYER:** Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records of the 2nd respondent in connection with order made in C.O.C.No.04/2025, dated 05.02.2025, passed against petitioner's husband Vignesh, aged 25 years, S/o.Ramadoss, confined at Central Prison, Cuddalore and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenue before this Court set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Dilli Ganesh

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 namely Vignesh, aged 25 years, S/o.Ramadoss, confined at Central Prison, Cuddalore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by



HCP.No.661 of 2025


WEB COPY

the second respondent dated 05.02.2025 issued against her husband, 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 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 a copy of the remand extension order has not been furnished to the detainee. It is therefore stated that the detainee is deprived of his valuable right to make effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, this Court finds that the detainee has not been furnished with a copy of the remand extension order. This non-



HCP.No.661 of 2025

WEB COPY

furnishing of the copy of the vital document would deprive the detenu of making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention.

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*



WEB COPY



HCP.No.661 of 2025

*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, 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



HCP.No.661 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 05.02.2025 in C.O.C.No.04/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Vignesh, aged 25 years, S/o.Ramadoss, confined at Central Prison, Cuddalore, 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 To  
The Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise  
Department, Government of Tamil  
Nadu, Fort St.George, Chennai-600  
009.



HCP.No.661 of 2025

WEB COPY

2.The District Collector And District Magistrate,  
Office of the District Collector,  
Mayiladuthurai.

3.The Superintendent Of Police,  
Office of the Superintendent of  
Police, Mayiladuthurai.

4.The Superintendent,  
Office of the Central Prison,  
Cuddalore.

5.The Inspector Of Police,  
Vaitheeswaran Koil Police Station,  
Sirkazhi Taluk, Mayiladuthurai.

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

7.The Public Prosecutor,  
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



*HCP.No.661 of 2025*

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

*Anu*

H.C.P.No.661 of 2025

13.06.2025