



H.C.P.No.1132 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 19-09-2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE J. NISHA BANU

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. SOUNTHAR

H.C.P.No.1132 of 2025

Meenakshi

W/o Anthonysamy

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Secretary to the Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Chennai – 600 009.

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Vepery,
Chennai – 600 007.

3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison-II, Puzhal,
Chennai – 600 066.

4. The Inspector of Police,
J-1, Saidapet Police Station,
Chennai – 600 015

... 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 of the detention order passed by the second respondent in No.267/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 20.05.2025 against her son Madhan



H.C.P.No.1132 of 2025

and set aside the same and to produce the detenu Mr.Madhan, aged 29 years, S/o Anthonysamy, who is detained in Central Prison II, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set him at liberty

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Rafi Babu

For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the mother of the detenue, viz., Madhan, aged 29 years, S/o Anthonysamy, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent in No.267/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 20.05.2025, 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] read with the order issued by the Government in G.O.(D).No.97 Home Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department dated 11.04.2025 under sub section (2) of section 3 of the said Act.



H.C.P.No.1132 of 2025

WEB COPY 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 that the final report of the adverse case has not been properly translated. This deprived the detainee from making effective representation. Therefore, he would state that the detention order is liable to be quashed.

4. On perusal of the documents available on record, particularly, in Volume-II, Page Nos.5 to 8 of the booklet, it is seen that the final report of the adverse case has been partially translated and hence, it has not been translated properly. Therefore, the detainee is deprived from making effective representation and that the Detention Order passed by the Detaining Authority is vitiated.



H.C.P.No.1132 of 2025

5. In this context, it is useful to refer to the judgment of the

WEB COPY 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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1132 of 2025

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.

7. Accordingly, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the detention order passed by the second respondent respondent in No.267/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 20.05.2025 is hereby



H.C.P.No.1132 of 2025

set aside. The detenu, viz., Madhan, aged 29 years, S/o Anthonysamy, who is now confined in the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, is 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.)
19.09.2025

vsi
To

1. The Secretary to the Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Chennai – 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Vepery,
Chennai – 600 007.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison-II, Puzhal,
Chennai – 600 066.
4. The Inspector of Police,
J-1, Saidapet Police Station,
Chennai – 600 015
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Chennai



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1132 of 2025

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

vsi

H.C.P.No.1132 of 2025

19-09-2025