



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1521 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 24.09.2025

C O R A M

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE J.NISHA BANU

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

H.C.P.No.1521 of 2025

Parvathi

... Petitioner

-VS-

1. Government of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by its Deputy Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Chepauk, Chennai-5.
2. The District Magistrate & District Collector,
District Collectorate, Uthagamandalam,
Nilgiris.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Coimbatore.
4. The Inspector of Police,
AWPS - Coonoor,
Nilgiris.

... Respondents

Prayer: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records pertaining to the impugned Preventive Detention order passed by the 2nd Respondent in order in Cr.M.P.No.02/2025 dated 28.05.2025 by detaining the detenue under Section 2 (ggg) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14/1982 and quash the same and



H.C.P.No.1521 of 2025

direct the respondent to produce the detenue namely Umeshwaran aged 26 years Son of Velliangiri residing at D.No.22/20 Nedungalcombai Manjacombai Melur Connor Taluk Nilgiris - 643221 who is detained in Central Prison Coimbatore before this Hon`ble Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.Naveenkumar
For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan
Addl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(By J.Nisha Banu,J.)

The petitioner herein, who is the mother of the detenue, namely, Umeshwaran, S/o.Velliyangiri, Male, aged 26 years, detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore, has come forward with this petition, challenging the detention order dated 28.05.2025, passed by the second respondent in Cr.M.P.No.02/2025, 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



H.C.P.No.1521 of 2025

Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

WEB COPY

3. Though learned counsel for the petitioner has raised several other grounds to assail the order of detention, he has mainly focused his argument on the ground that there was no translated version of the Arrest Intimation Form in Page No.20 of Vol.I in vernacular language furnished to the detenu. This deprived the detenu from making effective representation. Therefore, on the sole ground, the detention order is liable to be quashed.

4. On perusal of the documents available on record, particularly in Page No.20 of the booklet (Vol.I), the translated copy of the Arrest Intimation Form in vernacular version has not been furnished to the detenu. Therefore, the detenu is deprived from making effective representation and 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 '*(1999) 2 SCC 413*'. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, after discussing the safeguards embodied in Article 22 (5) of the Constitution, observed that the



H.C.P.No.1521 of 2025

detenue 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 detenue, is

imperative. In the said context, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held in

Paragraphs 9 and 16 of th said judgment 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.”

6. In view of the ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court



H.C.P.No.1521 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, this Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the Detention Order passed by the **SECOND RESPONDENT** in **CR.M.P.NO.02/2025** dated **28.05.2025**, is hereby set aside. The detenu, viz., **UMESHWARAN**, S/o.Velliyangiri, aged 26 years, who is now confined in the **Central Prison, Coimbatore** is hereby directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless his presence is required in connection with any other case.

(J.N.B.J.) (S.S.J.)
24.09.2025

Index: Yes / No
Internet: Yes / No
ar

J.NISHA BANU, J.
AND
S.SOUNTHAR, J.
ar

To:

1. The Deputy Secretary to Government,

5 / 6



H.C.P.No.1521 of 2025

Government of Tamil Nadu
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Chepauk, Chennai-5.

WEB COPY

2. The District Magistrate & District Collector,
District Collectorate, Uthagamandalam,
Nilgiris.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Coimbatore.
4. The Inspector of Police,
AWPS - Coonoor,
Nilgiris.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.1521 of 2025

24.09.2025