



H.C.P.No.1192 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 24-09-2025

CORAM:

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

AND

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

H.C.P.No.1192 of 2025

Malliga

W/o Kothandan


..Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Vellore District.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Vellore District, Vellore
4. The Inspector of Police,
Melpatti Police Station,
Vellore 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 relating to the Order passed by the second respondent herein to C3/D.O.No.25/2025 dated 29.05.2025 and quash the same and produce the detenu, Ajithkumar, aged about 26 years, son of Kothandan, who is detained in Central Prison, Vellore, before this Court and set him t



H.C.P.No.1192 of 2025

WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Gopalakrishnan

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., Ajithkumar, aged 26 years, S/o Kothandan, who is confined at Central Prison, Vellore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent in C3/D.O.No.25/2025 dated 29.05.2025, 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.140 Home Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department dated 11.04.2025 under sub section (2) of section 3 of the said Act.

2. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner



H.C.P.No.1192 of 2025


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 detenu was furnished with illegible copies of the confession statement. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

4. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor would also fairly state that the confession statement furnished to the detenu is illegible.

5. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that the confession statement, at Page Nos.11 to 13 of Vol-I of the booklet, furnished to the detenu, is illegible. This furnishing of illegible copies of the vital document would deprive the detenu of making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention.

6. In this context, it is useful to refer to the judgment of the Hon'ble



H.C.P.No.1192 of 2025

Supreme Court in '**Powanammal Vs. State of Tamil Nadu**' reported in
WEB CO (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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1192 of 2025

detenu 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 C3/D.O.No.25/2025 dated 29.05.2025 is hereby set aside. The detenu, viz., Ajithkumar, aged 26 years, S/o Kothandan, who is now confined in the Central Prison, Vellore, 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.)

vsi

24.09.2025

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Vellore District.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Vellore District, Vellore



H.C.P.No.1192 of 2025

4. The Inspector of Police,
Melpatti Police Station,
Vellore District.

5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Chennai



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1192 of 2025

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

vsi

H.C.P.No.1192 of 2025

24-09-2025