



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1940 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.1940 of 2025

Jagadheesh

... Petitioner/Detenuer's Father

-VS-

1. State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by the Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Avadi, Chennai – 600 077.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai District.
4. The Inspector of Police,
B4, Sevvapet Police Station,
Sevvapet, Thiruvallur 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 detenuer's detention order passed by the 2nd respondent vide order No. 100/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 10.07.2025 and set aside the same and produce the petitioner's son J.Karthick, S/o.Jagadheesh, Male aged 25 years



H.C.P.No.1940 of 2025

now detained in Central Prison Puzhal Chennai before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Jagan

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

ORDER

The petitioner herein, who is the father of the detenue, namely, J.Karthick, S/o.Jagadheesh, Male aged 25 years, detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai has come forward with this petition, challenging the detention order dated 10.07.2025, passed by the second respondent in 100/BCDFGISSSV/2025, 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 Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.



H.C.P.No.1940 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.31 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.31 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.1940 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.1940 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 100/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated **10.07.2025**, is hereby set aside. The detenue, viz., J.Karthick, S/o.Jagadheesh, Male aged 25 years , who is now confined in the **Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai** 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.

