



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1261 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 27.10.2025

C O R A M

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN

H.C.P.No.1261 of 2025

Rajakumaran

... Petitioner/Detenuue's Son

-VS-

1. The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Villupuram District, Villupuram.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Villupuram District, Villupuram.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Cuddalore.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Auroville Police Station,
Villupuram District.

... Respondents

Prayer: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the second respondent dated 24.06.2025 in RC.No.C2/31/2025 against the petitioner's father Ravichandran male aged



H.C.P.No.1261 of 2025

67 years S/o.Kannaiyan who is confined at Central prison Cuddalore and setaside the same and direct the respondent to produce the detenue before the Honble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Balaji
For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan
Addl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.
AND
M.JOTHIRAMAN, J.

The petitioner herein, who is the son of the detenue, namely, Ravichandran, S/o.Kannaiyan, aged about 67 years, detained at Central Prison, Cuddalore, has come forward with this petition, challenging the detention order dated 24.06.2025, passed by the second respondent in RC.No.C2/31/2025, branding him as a "Bootlegger", as contemplated under Section 2(b) of 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).

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

3. Though several points have been raised by the learned



H.C.P.No.1261 of 2025

counsel for the petitioner, it is stated that the detention order is liable to be quashed on the ground that the detainee was furnished with illegible copy at Page No.48 in Vol.I of the booklet. Hence, it is submitted that the detainee was deprived of making effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that Page No.48 of the Booklet in Volume-I furnished to the detainee, is illegible. This furnishing of illegible copy of the vital document would deprive the detainee 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 '*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 detainee 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 detainee, is imperative. In the said context, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has



H.C.P.No.1261 of 2025

held in Paragraphs 9 and 16 {as in SCC journal} as follows:

WEB COPY

“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 detainee 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 detainee'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 detainee, 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 detainee 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



H.C.P.No.1261 of 2025

and in view of the aforesaid facts, this Court is of the view that the detention order is liable to be quashed.

7. For the aforesaid reasons, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the Detention Order passed by the Second Respondent in RC.No.C2/31/2025 dated 24.06.2025 is hereby set aside. The detenue, viz., Ravichandran, S/o.Kannaiyan, aged about 67 years, who is now confined in the Central Prison, Cuddalore, is hereby directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless his presence is required in connection with any other case.

(N.S.K,J.,) (M.J.R,J.,)
27.10.2025

Index: Yes / No
Internet: Yes / No
ar

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.
AND

