



*HCP.No.1552 of 2025*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 29.10.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR . JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN

H.C.P.No.1552 of 2025

Perundevi

... Petitioner/  
Mother of the detenu

Versus

1. The State of Tamil Nadu  
Rep. By the Additional Chief Secretary to  
Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department  
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009
2. The Commissioner of Police  
Avadi City Police Commissioner  
Office of the Commissioner of Police  
Avadi, Chennai – 600 54
3. The Superintendent of Police  
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai-66
4. The Inspector of Police  
M-2 Madhavaram Milk Colony Police Station



*HCP.No.1552 of 2025*

Chennai

..

Respondents

WEB COPY

Prayer:- Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records relating to the detention order in Memo No.84/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 11.06.2022 passed by the second respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondent to produce the petitioner's son Jayaprakash, S/o.Kasi, aged 44 years, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Naresh

For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan  
Additional Public Prosecutor

### ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.)

The petitioner, who is the mother of the detenu Jayaprakash, S/o.Kasi, male, aged 44 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 11.06.2025 bearing reference No.84/BCDFGISSSV/2025 slapped on her son Jayaprakash, S/o.Kasi, aged 44 years, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous



*HCP.No.1552 of 2025*

WEB COPY

Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand 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 several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the order of Detention passed by the Detaining Authority is vitiated for material irregularities, as the remand extension order dated 27.05.2023 has not been translated correctly to the vernacular language. It is, therefore, stated that the detenu is deprived of his valuable right to make effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, in particular, Page Nos.76 and 77, it is seen that, in the translated copy of the remand extension order, it is wrongly stated as “27.05.2025 அன்று வழங்கப்பட்ட நீதிமன்றக் காவல் ஆணை“. Hence, this Court finds that there is an erroneous translation of the Remand Extension Order in the vernacular version.



**HCP.No.1552 of 2025**

WEB COPY

5.It is in the said circumstances, this Court finds that serious prejudice is caused to the detenu on account of incorrect translation in making effective representation against the Detention Order 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*



**HCP.No.1552 of 2025**

*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*



WEB COPY



**HCP.No.1552 of 2025**

*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 reasons, this Court is of the view that the detention order is liable to be quashed.

8. In view of the aforesaid reason, the detention order passed by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent dated 11.06.2025 in No.84/BCDFGISSSV/2025 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Jayaprakash, S/o.Kasi, male, aged 44 years, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless he is required in connection with any other case.

**[N.S.K.,J.]                      [M.J.R.,J.]**  
29.10.2025

Index: Yes/No  
Neutral Citation: Yes/No  
gpa



*HCP.No.1552 of 2025*

To  
WEB COPY

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to  
Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department  
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009
2. The Commissioner of Police  
Avadi City Police Commissioner  
Office of the Commissioner of Police  
Avadi, Chennai – 600 54
3. The Superintendent of Police  
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai-66
4. The Inspector of Police  
M-2 Madhavaram Milk Colony Police Station  
Chennai
5. The Joint Secretary to Government  
Public (Law & Order)  
Fort Saint George, Chennai – 9
6. The Public Prosecutor  
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



*HCP.No.1552 of 2025*

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.,

AND

M.JOTHIRAMAN, J.,

gpa

H.C.P.No.1552 of 2025

29.10.2025