



H.C.P.No.1457 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 26-09-2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE J. NISHA BANU

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. SOUNTHAR

H.C.P.No.1457 of 2025

Muthumari,

W/o Punniyakodi

..Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Addl.Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.


2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.

3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai District.

4. The Inspector of Police,
R-11, Ramapuram Police Station,
Chennai District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: The Habeas Corpus Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records in connection with the detention order in No.300/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 02.06.2025 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body and person of the petitioner's son named Mr. Ruban Kumar S/o Punniyakodi, aged about 27 years now confined at Central Prison,



H.C.P.No.1457 of 2025

Puzhal, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Muthamizhselvakumar

For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

J.Nisha Banu,J.

and

S.Sounthar,J

The petitioner is the mother of the detenue, viz., Ruban Kumar, aged 27 years, S/ Punniyakodi, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent in No.300/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 02.06.2025, 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] read with the order issued by the Government in G.O.(D).No.97 Home Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department dated 11.04.2025 under sub section (2) of section 3 of the said Act.

2. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents. We have also perused the records produced by the Detaining



H.C.P.No.1457 of 2025

Authority.


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 final report was not properly translated in tamil version. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

4. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor would also fairly states that the final report has not been translated properly in tamil version.

5. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that in Vol.II at page Nos. 105 to 112, the final report, furnished to the detenue, was not translated fully in tamil version. Therefore, the detenue is deprived from making effective representation and that the Detention Order passed by the Detaining Authority is vitiated.

6. 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



H.C.P.No.1457 of 2025


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 allowed.”

In view of the ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and in view



H.C.P.No.1457 of 2025

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

7. Accordingly, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the detention order passed by the second respondent in No.300/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 02.06.2025 is hereby set aside. The detenu, viz., Mr. Ruban Kumar S/o Punniyakodi, aged about 27 years, who is now confined in the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, is hereby directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless his presence is required in connection with any other case.


(J.NISHA BANU J.) (S.SOUNTHAR J.)

vsi

26.09.2025

To

1. The Addl.Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai District.
4. The Inspector of Police,
R-11, Ramapuram Police Station,
Chennai District.
5. The Public Prosecutor,



High Court, Chennai

WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1457 of 2025



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1457 of 2025

J. NISHA BANU, J.
and
S. SOUNTHAR, J.

vsi

H.C.P.No.1457 of 2025

26-09-2025