



WEB COPY



HCP.No.806 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 09.07.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.806 of 2025

A.Rany

... Petitioner

Vs

1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
(Authorised Officer),
Tiruvannamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Thiruvannamalai District,
Thiruvannamalai.

4.The Chief Superintendent of Jail,
Vellore Central Prison,
Vellore District.

5.The Inspector of Police,
Vettavalam Police Station,
Tiruvannamalai District.

...Respondents



HCP.No.806 of 2025

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records of the second respondent in relation to impugned detention order made in D.O.No.13/2025 – C2 dated 03.04.2025 and set aside the same and consequently, direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's son Chandru aged 36 years presently detained in Central prison, Vellore, Vellore District and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Balamurugan

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the father of the detinue, Chandru S/o. Arjunan aged about 35 years, confined at Central prison, Vellore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 03.04.2025 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].



HCP.No.806 of 2025

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 detinue is deprived of his valuable right to make effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet in Volume-I, particularly page No.108, this Court finds that a copy of the arrest intimation is available in both Tamil and English. However, certain portions of the English version have not been translated into the vernacular language. 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 detinue 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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.806 of 2025

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 in view of the aforesaid facts, this Court is of the view that the detention order is liable to be quashed.



HCP.No.806 of 2025

WEB COPY

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 03.04.2025 in D.O.No.13/2025-C2, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenue viz., Chandru s/o. Arjunan aged about 35 years, confined at Central prison, Vellore, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R., J]
09.07.2025

[V.L.N., J]

nl

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No



HCP.No.806 of 2025

WEB COPY

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
(Authorised Officer),
Tiruvannamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Tiruvannamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.
4. The Chief Superintendent of Jail,
Vellore Central Prison,
Vellore District.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Vettavalam Police Station,
Tiruvannamalai District.
6. The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai
7. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.806 of 2025

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

H.C.P.No.806 of 2025



WEB COPY



HCP.No.806 of 2025

09.07.2025