



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 14-10-2025

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MRS JUSTICE J. NISHA BANU
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S. SOUNTHAR**

H.C.P No. 1640 of 2025

1. Shiva Kumari
W/o. Basavaraju, No.204, Kothanur
Chariman Building, J.P.Nagar,
8th Phase, New Mariamman Kovil,
Bannerghatta Road, Bangalore,
Karnataka-560078.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to the
Government
(Home) Prohibition and Excise
Department, Secretariat,
Chennai.600009.

2.The District Collector and District
Magistrate
Tirupathur District, Tirupathur.

3.The Superintendent of Police
Tirupathur District.



4.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Salem, Salem District.

5.The Inspector of Police
vaniyambadi Police Station,
Tirupathur District.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

The Habeas Corpus Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the second respondent dated 30.04.2025 in C3/D/O/No.10/2025 against the petitioner's son Sanjay Kumar son of Basavaraj aged about 27 years who is confined at Central Prison, Salem and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. A.Samson

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

ORDER

J.NISHA BANU, J.

AND

S.SOUNTHAR, J.

The petitioner herein is the mother of the detenu viz., Sanjaykumar, S/o.Basavaraj, aged about 27 years, confined at Central Prison, Salem, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 30.04.2025 slapped on her son, branding him as "Drug



Offender" 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.

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 detenu was furnished with illegible copies in the booklet. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

4. On a perusal of Volume II of the Booklet, it is seen that Page Nos.6 to 8 in the booklet furnished to the detenu, are illegible. This furnishing of illegible copies of the vital document would deprive the detenu of making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention.

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 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

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 30.04.2025 in C3/D.O.No.10/2025, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is **allowed**. The detenu viz., **Sanjaykumar, S/o.Basavaraj**, aged 27 years, confined at Central Prison, Salem, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case.

(J.NISHA BANU J.) (S.SOUNTHAR J.)

14-10-2025

ASI

To

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to the
Government
(HOME) Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600009.



2. The District Collector and District Magistrate
Tirupathur District, Tirupathur.

3. The Superintendent of Police
Tirupathur District.

4. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Salem, Salem District.

5. The Inspector of Police
Vaniyambadi Police Station,
Tirupathur District.

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



WEB COPY

HCP No. 1640 of 2025



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

ASI

H.C.P.No. 1640 of 2025

14-10-2025