



WEB COPY

HCP No. 1110 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 23-09-2025

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MRS JUSTICE J. NISHA BANU
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S. SOUNTHAR**

H.C.P No. 1110 of 2025

1. Selvam

S/o. Murugaiyan, Kizhakku Theru,
Kodiyakadu, Vedaranyam Taluk,
Vedaranyam District.

Petitioner(s)


Vs

1. The Secretary to the Governement,
Home prohibition and Excise Dept.,
Secretariat, chennai - 600009.

2.District collector and District
Magistrate of
Nagapattinam District, Nagapattinam.

3.The superintendent of Police,
Nagapattinam District, Nagapattinam.

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



5. The Inspector of Police,
Velipalayam police Station,
Nagapattinam District.

WEB COPY

Respondent(s)

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 connection with the order of Detention passed by the second respondent 25.05.2025 in C.O.C.No.16/2025 against the petitioner brother in law, Thiru.Prakash, male aged 29 years S/o. Ramasamy who is confined at Central prison, Cuddalore and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenue before the Hon'ble court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. D.Balaji

For Respondent(s): Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan,
Additional Public Prosecutor


ORDER

J.NISHA BANU J.

and

S.SOUNTHAR J.


The petitioner herein is the uncle of the detenu viz., Prakash, Male, 29 years, S/o. Ramasamy, confined at Central Prison, Cuddalore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 25.05.2025 slapped on his brother-in-law, 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. 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 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.120, 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.12 and 13 of the Volume – II, a copy of the Government Order in G.O.(D).No.120, 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 detenu. Therefore, the detenu is deprived from making effective representation and 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 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



WEB COPY



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.

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 25.05.2025 in C.O.C.No.16/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenue viz., **Prakash**, male, aged 29 years, **S/o.Ramasamy**, detained at Central Prison, Cuddalore, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case.

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

23-09-2025

ASI



To

1. The Secretary to the Government,
Home prohibition and Excise Dept.,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600009.

2. District collector and District
Magistrate of
Nagapattinam District, Nagapattinam.

3. The superintendent of Police,
Nagapattinam District, Nagapattinam.

4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, cuddalore.

5. The Inspector of Police,
Velipalayam police Station,
Nagapattinam District.

6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras, Chennai.



WEB COPY

HCP No. 1110 of 2025



J.NISHA BANU J.
AND
S.SOUNTHAR J.

ASI

H.C.P No. 1110 of 2025

23-09-2025