



H.C.P.No.1308 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.1308 of 2025

Rupashree

W/o Yuvaraj

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.

2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Namakkal,
Namakkal District.

3. The Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Superintendent of Police,
Namakkal District.

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

5. The Inspector of Police,
Namakkal Police Station,
Namakkal 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



H.C.P.No.1308 of 2025

for the entire records, connected with the detention order of the respondent No.2 in CMP No.43/GOONDA/2025(M1) dated 10.05.2025 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu by name Thiru.Yuvaraj, Son of Siva, aged about 24 years, now confining at Salem Central Prison before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Nirmal Krishnan

For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan
Additional Public Prosecutor


ORDER

J.Nisha Banu,J.

and

S.Sounthar,J

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu, viz., Yuvaraj, Son of Siva, aged about 24 years, who is confined at Central Prison, Salem has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent in CMP No.43/GOONDA/2025(M1) dated 10.05.2025 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



H.C.P.No.1308 of 2025

[Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982] read with the order issued by the

Government in G.O.(D).No.121 Home Prohibition and 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 the the remand report has not been properly translated in tamil version. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

4. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor would also fairly submit that the remand report has not been properly translated in tamil version.

5. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that at Volume-I page No.112, the remand report, furnished to the detenue, was not properly



H.C.P.No.1308 of 2025

translated in tamil version. Therefore, the detenue 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.1308 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 CMP No.43/GOONDA/2025(M1) dated 10.05.2025 is hereby set aside. The detenu, viz., Yuvaraj, Son of Siva, aged about 24 years, who is now



H.C.P.No.1308 of 2025

confined in the Central Prison, Salem 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.)
22.09.2025

vsi

To

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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1308 of 2025

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

vsi

H.C.P.No.1308 of 2025

22-09-2025