



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1556 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.1556 of 2025

Dhanasekaran

... Petitioner/Detenue's father

-VS-

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.

3. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai – 66.

4. The Inspector of Police, Law & Order,
E-1, Mylapore Police Station, Chennai.

... 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 second respondent dated 14.07.2025 in Memo No.474/BCDFGISSSV/2025 against the petitioner son namely Silambarasan Male aged 24 years S/o.Dhanasekaran who is confined at Central Prison Puzhal Chennai and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenue before the Honble Court and set him at Liberty.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1556 of 2025

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Senthilvel
For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan
Addl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

The petitioner herein, who is the father of the detenue, namely, Silambarasan, S/o.Dhanasekaran, Male aged 24 years, detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai has come forward with this petition, challenging the detention order dated 14.07.2025 , passed by the second respondent in Memo No.474/BCDFGISSSV/2025, branding him as a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) 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.

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 Government Order so mentioned in the



H.C.P.No.1556 of 2025

detention order has not been furnished to the detainee. This deprived the detenu from making effective representation. Therefore, on the sole ground, the detention order is liable to be quashed.

4. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor has not refuted the non-supply of the Government Order to the detainee, which is nothing, but the delegation of power to the Detaining Authority by the Government.

5. On perusal of the entire booklet, it is seen that the Government Order in G.O.(D) No.97, Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department dated 11.04.2025, as found indicated in the detention order has not been furnished to the detainee. Therefore, the detainee 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



H.C.P.No.1556 of 2025

discussing the safeguards embodied in Article 22 (5) of the Constitution, observed that the 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 detenuee be set free



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1556 of 2025

forthwith unless she is required to be detained in any other case. The appeal is accordingly allowed.”

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. For the aforesaid reasons, this Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the Detention Order passed by the **SECOND RESPONDENT** in Memo No.474/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated **14.07.2025**, is hereby set aside. The detinue, viz., Silambarasan, S/o.Dhanasekaran, aged 24 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.

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

Index: Yes / No
Internet: Yes / No
ar

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.
AND

