



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1537 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 30.10.2025

C O R A M

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN

H.C.P.No.1537 of 2025

Suguna

... Petitioner/Detenue's Wife

-VS-

1. The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Dept.,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
2. District Collector and District Magistrate of Ranipet District,
Ranipet-1.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Ranipet District, Ranipet.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Vellore.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Timirii Police Station,
Ranipet 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 2nd Respondent dated 09.07.2025 in B3/D.O.No.57/2025 against the petitioner Husband Babu, M/Aged 35 yrs



H.C.P.No.1537 of 2025

S/o.Sekar who is confined at Central Prison, Vellore and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenue before the Honble Court and set him at liberty and pass such further or other orders

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

ORDER

The petitioner herein, who is the wife of the detenue, namely, Babu, S/o.Sekar, male, aged 35 years, detained at Central Prison, Vellore, has come forward with this petition, challenging the detention order dated 09.07.2025, passed by the second respondent in B3/D.O.No.57/2025, branding him as a "Sexual Offender", as contemplated under Section 2(ggg) 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.



H.C.P.No.1537 of 2025

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 detainee was furnished with illegible copy at Page No.8 in Vol.II 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.8 of the Booklet in Volume-II 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



H.C.P.No.1537 of 2025

detenue, 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 detenue 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 detenue'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 detenue, 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.”



H.C.P.No.1537 of 2025

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. For the aforesaid reasons, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the Detention Order passed by the Second Respondent in B3/D.O.No.57/2025 dated 09.07.2025 is hereby set aside. The detenue, viz., Babu, S/o.Sekar, male, aged 35 years, 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.

(N.S.K,J.,) (M.J.R,J.,)
30.10.2025

Index: Yes / No
Internet: Yes / No
ar



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1537 of 2025

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

To:

1. The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Dept.,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
2. District Collector and District Magistrate of Ranipet District,
Ranipet-1.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Ranipet District, Ranipet.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Vellore.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Timirii Police Station,
Ranipet District.
6. The Joint Secretary to Government
Public (Law & Order),
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.
7. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.1537 of 2025

30.10.2025