



WEB COPY

HCP No. 1483 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 03-11-2025

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE N. SATHISH KUMAR
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN**

HCP No. 1483 of 2025

Malarvizhi

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. State of Tamil Nadu represented ,
by secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.

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

4.State Rep by Inspector of Police,
E-4, Abiramipuram Police Station,
Chennai.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

This writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to



issue a Writ of habeas Corpus, or any other appropriate order or direction, calling for the records of the 2nd Respondents pertaining to the order made in Memo no.424/BCDFGISSSV/2025, Dated 30.06.2025 in detaining the detenu under the Tamilnadu Act 14/1982 as a brand of Goonda and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu, Namely Dhanush @ martin, Son of Arivazhagan, aged 22 years, who is detained at the Central prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. Karthick.S

For Respondent(s): Mr. A.Gokulakrishnan,
Addl. Public Prosecutor,

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by N.Sathish Kumar J.)

The petitioner herein, who is the mother of the detenu viz.,Dhanush @ Martin, S/o Arivazhagan, aged about 22 years, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 30.06.2025 slapped on her son, 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].



2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

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 Arrest Intimation Report was not properly translated into Tamil version. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would also fairly state that the Arrest Intimation Form was not properly translated into Tamil version.

5. On a perusal of the booklet, it is seen that Page No.23 of the booklet furnished to the detenu, i.e., Arrest Intimation Report, was not properly translated into Tamil version. Therefore, the detenu 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 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.”

WEB COPY

7. 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.

8. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 30.06.2025 in No.424/BCDFGISSSV/2025 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., **Dhanush @ Martin S/o Arivazhagan**, aged about 22 years, confined at **Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai**, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

(N.SATHISH KUMAR J.) (M.JOTHIRAMAN J.)

03-11-2025

Index:Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet:Yes

Neutral Citation:Yes/No

mrp



To

1. The secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai - 600009.

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.

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

4. State Rep by Inspector of Police,
E-4, Abiramipuram Police Station,
Chennai.

5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras, Chennai.



WEB COPY

HCP No. 1483 of 2025



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

mrp

HCP No. 1483 of 2025

03-11-2025