



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1369 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 27.10.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR . JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN

H.C.P.No.1369 of 2025

Vinitha

... Petitioner/
Wife of the detenu

Versus

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat
Chennai – 600 009
2. The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai
3. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison
Puzhal, Chennai-66
4. The Inspector of Police, Law & Order
E-1, Mylapore Police Station
Chennai

.. Respondents



HCP.No.1369 of 2025

Prayer:- Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the second respondent dated 24.06.2025 in Memo No.391/BCDFGISSSV/2025 against the petitioner husband, namely Manikandan, male aged 30 years, S/o.Sundaram, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Senthilvel

For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan
Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

(Order of the Court was made by N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.)

The petitioner, who is the wife of the detenu Manikandan, male aged 30 years, S/o.Sundaram, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 24.06.2025 bearing reference No.391/BCDFGISSSV/2025 slapped on her husband, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand 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



HCP.No.1369 of 2025

Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

WEB COPY

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 remand 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 of Volume-I, particularly from page Nos.29, this Court finds the copies of the remand, which were in both Tamil and English, however, some portions of the English version have not been properly translated in Tamil. 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.

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



HCP.No.1369 of 2025

WEB COPY

'(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 detenue be set free forthwith unless she is required to be detained in any other case. The appeal is accordingly



HCP.No.1369 of 2025

allowed.”

WEB COPY

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. In view of the aforesaid reason, the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 24.06.2025 in No.391/BCDFGISSSV/2025 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Manikandan, S/o.Sundaram, male, aged 30 years, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless he is required in connection with any other case.

[N.S.K.,J.] [M.J.R.,J.]
27.10.2025

Index: Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
gpa



HCP.No.1369 of 2025

WEB COPY

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat
Chennai – 600 009
2. The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai
3. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison
Puzhal, Chennai-66
4. The Inspector of Police, Law & Order
E-1, Mylapore Police Station
Chennai
5. The Joint Secretary to Government
Public (Law & Order)
Fort Saint George, Chennai – 9
6. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1369 of 2025

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.,
AND

M.JOTHIRAMAN, J.,

gpa

H.C.P.No.1369 of 2025

27.10.2025