



H.C.P.No.925 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 22-09-2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE **J. NISHA BANU**

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **S. SOUNTHAR**

H.C.P.No.925 of 2025

M.Kasthoori,
W/o Maickam

..Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
 2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Office of District Magistrate and District Collector,
Salem District.
 3. The Commissioner of Police,
Salem, Salem District.
 4. The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Central Prison, Salem District.
 5. The Inspector of Police,
Sankagiri Police Station,
Salem District.
- ... Respondents

PRAYER: The Habeas Corpus Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records in detention order passed in C.M.P.No.02/GOONDA/



H.C.P.No.925 of 2025

C2/2025 dated 01.05.2025 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's son, Sasikumar, S/o Manickam aged 22 years, presently confined at Central Prison, Salem before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.Bharanidharan

For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

J.Nisha Banu,J.
and
S.Sounthar,J

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu, viz., Sasikumar, S/o Manickam aged 22 years, presently confined at Central Prison, Salem, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent in C.M.P.No.02/GOONDA/C2/2025 dated 01.05.2025 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] read with the order issued by the Government in G.O.(D).No.127, Home Prohibition and



H.C.P.No.925 of 2025


Excise (XVI) Department dated 11.04.2025 under section 3(2) of the
aforesaid Act.

2. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents. We have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.

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 in similar case referred to by the detaining authority, the date of arrest and the crime number is not translated properly in Tamil version. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

4. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor would also fairly states that the similar case bail order was not properly translated.

5. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that at Volume-I Page Nos. 39 to 41 of the booklet furnished to the detenu, the date of arrest and crime number in similar case referred to by the detaining authority in Crl.O.P.No.4919 of 2021, was not properly translated at paragraph



H.C.P.No.925 of 2025

No.1 of the said order. Therefore, the detenu is deprived from making effective representation and that the Detention Order passed by the Detaining Authority is vitiated.

6. 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



WEB COPY




H.C.P.No.925 of 2025

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.”*

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. Accordingly, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the detention order passed by the second respondent in C.M.P.No.02/GOONDA/C2/2025 dated 01.05.2025 dated 01.05.2025 is hereby set aside. The detenu, viz., Sasikumar, Son of Manickam, aged about 22 years, who is now confined in the Central Prison, Salem, is



H.C.P.No.925 of 2025

hereby directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless his presence is

required in connection with any other case.

(J.NISHA BANU J.) (S.SOUNTHAR J.)

22.09.2025

vsi

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Office of District Magistrate and District Collector,
Salem District.
3. The Commissioner of Police,
Salem, Salem District.
4. The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Central Prison, Salem District.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Sankagiri Police Station,
Salem District.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.925 of 2025

J. NISHA BANU, J.
and
S. SOUNTHAR, J.

vsi

H.C.P.No.925 of 2025

22-09-2025