



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1660 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.1660 of 2025

Vignesh

... Petitioner/Detenu

-VS-

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

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

3. The Superintendent of Police
Erode District.

4. The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Coimbatore.

5. The Inspector of Police,
Erode North Police Station,
Erode District.

... Respondents

Prayer: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the detention order passed by the second respondent pertaining to the order made in Cr.M.P.No.37/Drug Offender/2025 C1 of Tamil Nadu Act of 1982 as a Drug Offender and quash the same and direct the respondent to produce the



H.C.P.No.1660 of 2025

detenue, Vignesh, S/o.Murugananthan, aged about 25 years who is detained at Central Prison Coimbatore before this Honble Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.O.S.Thilak Pasumbadiyar

For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan
Addl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

The petitioner herein, who is the detenue himself, namely, Vignesh, S/o.Murugananthan, aged about 25 years, detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore has come forward with this petition, challenging the detention order dated 12.07.2025, passed by the second respondent in Cr.M.P.No.37/Drug Offender/2025 C1, branding him as a "Drug Offender", as contemplated under Section 2(e) 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.



H.C.P.No.1660 of 2025

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 there was no translated version of the Arrest Intimation Memo at Page No.20 of Vol.I furnished to the detenu. 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 translated version to the detenu.

5. On perusal of the documents available on record, particularly in Page No.20 of the booklet (Vol.I), the translated copy of the Arrest Intimation Memo 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.

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*'



H.C.P.No.1660 of 2025

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 detainee 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 detainee, is imperative. In the said context, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held in Paragraphs 9 and 16 of the 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 detainee 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 detainee'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 detainee, 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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1660 of 2025

illegal. We, therefore, direct that the detenuee be set free 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 Cr.M.P.No.37/Drug Offender/2025 C1 dated **12.07.2025**, is hereby set aside. The detenue, viz., Vignesh, S/o.Murugananthan, aged 25 years, who is now confined in the **Central Prison, Coimbatore** 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

