



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1775 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 09.10.2025

C O R A M

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE J.NISHA BANU

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

H.C.P.No.1775 of 2025

Thulasimangalam

... Petitioner/Detenuue's Mother

-VS-

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-9.

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

3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Coimbatore.

4. The Superintendent of Police,
Erode District.

5. The Inspector of Police,
PEW-Erode, Erode.

... 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 respondent against the detenue dated 08.04.2025 in detention order in Cr.MP.No.15/Drug Offender/2025 C1 and set aside the same and produce the detenue Jeevanantham, male, aged about 21 years,



H.C.P.No.1775 of 2025

S/o.Saravanan now detained in Central Prison, Coimbatore before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : M/s.R.Radha Pandian
For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan
Addl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(By J.Nisha Banu,J.)

The petitioner herein, who is the mother of the detenue, namely, Jeevanantham, S/o.Saravanan, male, aged about 21 years,, detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore, has come forward with this petition, challenging the detention order dated 08.04.2025, passed by the second respondent in Cr.MP.No.15/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.1775 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 Government Order dated 09.01.2025 in Page Nos.39 & 40 of Vol.II in vernacular language 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-furnishing of translated version of the Government Order dated 09.01.2025 to the detenu.

5. On perusal of the documents available on record, particularly in Page Nos.39 & 40 of the booklet (Vol.II), the translated copy of the Government Order dated 09.01.2025 in vernacular version 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.



H.C.P.No.1775 of 2025

6. In this context, it is useful to refer to the judgment of the

WEB CO 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 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 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 illegal. We, therefore, direct that the detainee 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.MP.No.15/Drug Offender/2025 C1** Dated **08.04.2025**, is hereby set

