



H.C.P.No.1625 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 29.08.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.1625 of 2025

Arun

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate
Nagapattinam District
Nagapattinam

3.The Superintendent of Police
Nagapattinam District

4.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison
Cuddalore

5.The Inspector of Police
Railway Police Circle
Nagapattinam

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to
issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the entire records in detention



H.C.P.No.1625 of 2025

order in C.O.C.No.4 of 2025, dated 13.03.2025, on the file of the 2nd respondent herein and set aside the same as illegal and direct the respondents to produce the body of person of the petitioner's son namely Arunpandi, male, 35 years, now detained at Central Prison, Cuddalore, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mrs.B.Kavitha

For Respondents : Mr.A.Damodaran
Additional Public Prosecutor
Assisted by M.Arifa Thasneem
Advocate

ORDER

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

The petitioner herein, who is the brother of the detenu, viz. Arunpandi, aged 35 years, S/o.Selladurai, confined at Central Prison, Cuddalore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 13.03.2025 slapped on his brother, 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



H.C.P.No.1625 of 2025


learned 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 the Arrest Intimation Form furnished to the detenu has not been translated. In this circumstances, learned counsel for petitioner stated that serious prejudice has been caused to the petitioner for making effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the documents available on record, particularly in Page No.7 of the booklet in Volume-I, a copy of the Arrest Intimation Form, dated 17.02.2025 is available and the translated copy in vernacular version of the same 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 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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1625 of 2025

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.”*

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. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 13.03.2025 in C.O.C.No.04/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz. Arunpandi, aged about 35 years, S/o.Selladurai, presently confined in Central Prison, Cuddalore is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case. No costs.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1625 of 2025

[M.S.R, J.]

[V.L.N, J.]

29.08.2025

kas

Index: Yes/No

Neutral Citation

Speaking / Non Speaking

To

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate
Nagapattinam District
Nagapattinam

3.The Superintendent of Police
Nagapattinam District

4.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison
Cuddalore

5.The Inspector of Police
Railway Police Circle
Nagapattinam

6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras, Chennai 600 104

M.S.RAMESH, J.

AND

V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

kas



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1625 of 2025

H.C.P.No.1625 of 2025

29.08.2025