



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1928 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.1928 of 2025

Perumal

...Petitioner/Detenue's Father

-VS-

- 1 . The State of Tamil Nadu Rep
by The Additional chief Secretary to the
Government Home prohibition and Excise
Department Fort St.George Secretariat
Chennai. 600009.
 2. The District Collector and District Magistrate
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate
Namakkal District.
 3. The Superintendent of Police
Office of the Superintendent of Police
Namakkal District.
 4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Salem.
 5. The Inspector of Police
Nallur Police Station, Namakkal District.
(Crime No. 77/2025)
- ... 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



H.C.P.No.1928 of 2025

order C.M.P.No.65/Goonda/2025/(M1) dated 02.07.2025 and quash the same. Consequently direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detainee name Ajithkumar, S/o.Perumal aged about 25 years now detained as Goonda at Central Prison, Salem and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Rajkumar
For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan
Addl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

The petitioner herein, who is the sister of the detainee, namely, Ajithkumar, S/o.Perumal aged about 25 years, detained at Central Prison, Salem, has come forward with this petition, challenging the detention order dated 02.07.2025, passed by the second respondent in C.M.P.No.65/GOONDA/2025/M1, 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



H.C.P.No.1928 of 2025

Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

WEB COPY

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 translated version of the Arrest Intimation Form as found in Page Nos.61 & 63 is improper. This deprived the detenu from making effective representation. Therefore, on the sole ground, the detention order is liable to be quashed.

4. On perusal of the documents available on record, particularly Page Nos.61 & 63 of the booklet (Vol.I), the Arrest Intimation Form has not been properly translated in its entirety with regard the offence. Therefore, the detenu is deprived from making effective representation and that the Detention Order passed by the Detaining Authority is vitiated.

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



H.C.P.No.1928 of 2025

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 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 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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1928 of 2025

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

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. For the aforesaid reasons, this Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the Detention Order passed by the 2nd respondent in C.M.P.No.65/GOONDA/2025/M1 dated 02.07.2025, is hereby set aside. The detinue, viz., Ajithkumar, S/o.Perumal aged about 25 years, who is now confined in the Central Prison, Salem 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

