



WEB COPY

HCP NO. 815 c



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: **04-07-2025**

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P. NO. 815 of 2025

SAMRIN

W/o.Mubarak, No.91, Nehru Nagar, Kallur, Gudiyatham Taluk,
Vellore District.

Petitioner(s)

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,
of Vellore District,
Vellore - 9.

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

4. The Inspector of Police,
Gudiyatham Town Police Station,
Vellore District.

5. The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Salem.

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 petitioner's husband detention under



Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order dated 24.03.2025 on the file and respondent herein made in proceedings C3/D.O.No.15/2025 and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the said petitioner's husband namely Mubarak, aged 28 years, son of Samsudeen, before this Court and set him at liberty, now petitioner's husband 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, viz. Mubarak, aged 28 years, S/o.Samsudeen, confined at Central Prison, Salem, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 24.03.2025 slapped on 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, as well as the learned Additional Public



Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.




WEB COPY

3. Though learned counsel for the petitioner has raised several other grounds to assail the order of detention, he has mainly focused his argument on the ground that the Remand Order has not been furnished to the detenu. In this circumstances, learned counsel for petitioner stated that serious prejudice has been caused to the petitioner for making effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the documents available on record, particularly in Page No.17 of the booklet in Volume-I, a copy of the Remand Order, dated 26.02.2025 is available and it is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the same has not been furnished to the detenu. Therefore, the detenu is deprived from making effective representation and 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



the


language which can be understood by the detenu, is imperative. In the said

Hon'ble Supreme Court has held in Paragraphs 9 and 16 {as in SCC journal} as follows:

WEB COPY

“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, renders her continued detention illegal. We, therefore, direct that the



*detenue be set free forthwith unless she is required to be detained in c
other case. The appeal is accordingly allowed.”*

WEB COPY

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 24.03.2025 in C3/D.O.No.15/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz. Mubarak, aged about 28 years, S/o.Samsudeen, presently confined in Central Prison, Salem is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

(M.S.RAMESH J.) (V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN J.)

04-07-2025

kas

Index: Yes / No

Neutral Citation

Speaking / Non Speaking


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

kas

To

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

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,



of Vellore District,
Vellore - 9.



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

4. The Inspector of Police,
Gudiyatham Town Police Station,
Vellore District.

5. The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Salem.

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

H.C.P NO. 815 of 2025

04.07.2025