



H.C.P.No.1200 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED : 18.07.2025

CORAM

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

H.C.P.No.1200 of 2025

Banumathi

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by its Secretary
Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St. George, Chennai 9

2.The District Magistrate and District Collector
O/o.The District Collector
Namakkal District


3.The Superintendent of Police
O/o.The Superintendent of Police
Namakkal District

4.The Superintendent
Central Prison
Salem

5.The Inspector of Police
Namakkal Police Station
Namakkal District

.. Respondents

1/6



H.C.P.No.1200 of 2025


Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for issuance of a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records of the detention order in C.M.P.No.27/Goonda/2025/M1 dated 30.03.2025 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the detenu Purusothaman, S/o.Sankar, aged about 24 years, who is now confined in Central Prison, Salem, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For petitioner : Mr.T.Dhasarathan
For respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the mother of the detenu, Purusothaman, S/o.Sankar, aged 24 years, confined at Central Prison, Salem, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 30.03.2025 issued against her son, 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].



H.C.P.No.1200 of 2025


WEB COPY

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned

Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

3. Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the order of Detention passed by the Detaining Authority is vitiated for material irregularities, as the copy of the bail order, has not been properly translated. It is therefore stated that the detenu is deprived of his valuable right to make effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet in Volume-II, particularly in page Nos.55 to 58, this Court finds a copy of the bail order in Cr.M.P.No.1144 of 2024 in both Tamil and English. However, some portion of the English version in page 56 has not been translated to its vernacular version. Therefore, this Court is of the view that the improper translation of the copy of the vital document relied upon by the Detaining Authority to arrive at a subjective satisfaction, would deprive the detenu of his valuable right to make effective representation. It is in the said circumstances, this Court finds that the Detention Order passed by the Detaining Authority is vitiated.




H.C.P.No.1200 of 2025

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 document in the language known to and understood by the detenu, should the document be in a different language.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1200 of 2025

..... 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 2nd respondent on 30.03.2025 in C.M.P.No.27/Goonda/2025/M1, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Purusothaman, S/o.Sankar, aged 24 years, confined at Central Prison, Salem, 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.)
18.07.2025

Index : Yes/No
Neutral Citation : Yes/No
gya



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1200 of 2025

M.S.RAMESH, J.

AND

V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

gya

To

1.The Secretary
Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St. George, Chennai 9

2.The District Magistrate and District Collector
O/o.The District Collector
Namakkal District

3.The Superintendent of Police
O/o.The Superintendent of Police
Namakkal District

H.C.P.No.1200 of 2025

4.The Superintendent
Central Prison
Salem

5.The Inspector of Police
Namakkal Police Station
Namakkal District

6.The Joint Secretary
Law and Order Department
Secretariat, Chennai

18.07.2025

7.The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras