



WEB COPY



HCP.No.995 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 28.08.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.995 of 2025

Vaitheeswari

... Petitioner/wife of the detenue

Vs.

1. Government of Tamilnadu, rep by
its Additional Chief Secretary
Secretary, Home, Prohibition and
Excise Department, Secretariat,
Chennai 600009.

2.The District Magistrate and
District Collector
Erode District.

3.The Superintendent of Police
Office of Superintendent of Police,
Erode District.

4.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Coimbatore District.

5.The Inspector of Police
Chithode Police Station, Erode
District.

... Respondents



HCP.No.995 of 2025

WEB COPY

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records in Detention order passed in CrI.M.P.No.19/GOONDA/2025 C1 dated 26.04.2025 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the Petitioner's husband Detenu Boopalan, S/o.Prakasam, aged 32 years, confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore District before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Padmanabhan
For Respondents : Mr.A.Damodaran
Additional Public Prosecutor
assisted by M.Arifa Thasneem

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the wife of the detenu namely Boopalan, S/o.Prakasam, aged 32 years, confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 26.04.2025 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




HCP.No.995 of 2025

WEB COPY
[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 the 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 Government Order in G.O.(D).No.112, Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department dated 11.04.2025 has not been translated in vernacular language. This deprived the detenu from making effective representation. Therefore, on the sole ground, the detention order is liable to be quashed.

4. On perusal of the documents available on record, particularly in Page Nos.275 and 276 of the booklet in Volume-II, a copy of the Government Order in G.O.(D).No.112, Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department dated 11.04.2025 is available and the translated copy in vernacular version of the same has not been furnished to the detenue.



HCP.No.995 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 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 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



HCP.No.995 of 2025

order is liable to be quashed.
WEB COPY

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 26.04.2025 in CrI.M.P.No.19/GOONDA/2025 C1, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Boopalan, S/o.Prakasam, aged 32 years, confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore 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]

28.08.2025

(3/3)

Index: Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Anu



HCP.No.995 of 2025

To
WEB COPY

1. Government of Tamilnadu, rep by
its Additional Chief Secretary
Secretary, Home, Prohibition and
Excise Department, Secretariat,
Chennai 600009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and
District Collector
Erode District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police
Office of Superintendent of Police,
Erode District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Coimbatore District.
- 5.The Inspector of Police
Chithode Police Station, Erode
District.
- 6.The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.
- 7.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.995 of 2025

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

Anu

H.C.P.No.995 of 2025

28.08.2025

(3/3)