



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1248 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 01.08.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.1248 of 2025

Sokkammal

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State rep. by
The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, Government of Tamilnadu
Fort St.George,Chennai-600 009.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Cuddalore District, Cuddalore

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Cuddalore

4.The Inspector of Police,
Nellikuppam Police Station,
Cuddalore District

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to



H.C.P.No.1248 of 2025

issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records pertaining to the order of detention passed in No.C3/D.O/62/2025 dated 30.04.2025 by the 2nd respondent and quash the same as illegal and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's son namely Suriya @ Sunami Suriya, aged about 26 years, S/o.Mani, before this Court, now confined in Central Prison, Cuddalore and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Senthil Kumar

For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by *M.S. RAMESH, J.*)

The petitioner herein, who is the mother of the detenu namely Suriya @ Sunami Suihya, aged about 26 years, S/o.Mani, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 30.04.2025 issued against her son, branding him as "Drug Offender" under Section 2(e) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned



H.C.P.No.1248 of 2025


Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

WEB COPY

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 partially not translated copy of the final report. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet particularly in page Nos.16 and 17, it is seen that the Final report is partially in English and partially in vernacular language. This non-furnishing of the copy of the vital document would deprive the detenu of making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention.

5. In this context, it is useful to refer to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of '*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



H.C.P.No.1248 of 2025

WEB COPY

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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1248 of 2025

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 detention order passed by the second respondent on 30.04.2025 in C3/D.O./62/2025 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Suriya @ Sunami Suriya, aged about 26 years, S/o.Mani, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1248 of 2025

[M.S.R, J.]

[V.L.N, J.]

01.08.2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking order/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

ssd



H.C.P.No.1248 of 2025

WEB COPY

- To
- 1.The State rep. by
The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, Government of Tamilnadu
Fort St.George,Chennai-600 009.
 - 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Cuddalore District, Cuddalore
 - 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Cuddalore
 - 4.The Inspector of Police,
Nellikuppam Police Station,
Cuddalore District
 - 5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
 - 6.The Joint Secretary, Public (Law & Order),
Chennai – 600 009.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1248 of 2025

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

ssd

H.C.P.No.1248 of 2025

01.08.2025