



H.C.P.No.2087 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 24.11.2025

C O R A M

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN

H.C.P.No.2087 of 2025

Mrs.Rajeshwari

... Petitioner/Detenue's mother

-VS-

1. The State Rep. by its

The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,
Fort St.George, Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.

2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Office of the District Magistrate and Collector,
Tiruppur District, Tiruppur.

3. The Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Superintendent of Police,
Tiruppur District.

4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison at Coimbatore,
Gandhipuram, Coimbatore.

5. The Inspector of Police,
Komaramangalam Police Station
Tiruppur District.

... Respondents

Prayer: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records in Detention order in



H.C.P.No.2087 of 2025

No.Cr.M.P.No.62/Goonda/2025 dated 25.07.2025 on the file of the 2nd respondent and set aside the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the son of the petitioner/detenu Mr.Muruganantham, S/o.Ramu, aged 24 years now confined in Central Prison at Coimbatore before this Honble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : M/s.R.Subadra Devi
For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan
Addl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

The petitioner herein, who is the mother of the detenue, namely, Muruganantham, S/o.Ramu, aged 24 years, detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore, Chennai has come forward with this petition, challenging the detention order dated 25.07.2025, passed by the second respondent in Cr.M.P.No.62/Goonda/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.2087 of 2025

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 Government Order so mentioned in the detention order has not been 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 of the Government Order to the detenu, which is nothing, but the delegation of power to the Detaining Authority by the Government.

5. On perusal of the entire booklet, it is seen that the Government Order in G.O.(D) No.227, Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department dated 16.07.2025, as found indicated in the detention order has not been furnished to the detenu in the vernacular language. Therefore, the detenu is deprived from making effective representation and that the Detention Order passed by the Detaining Authority is vitiated.



WEB COPY

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*' 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 detinue 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 detinue, 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 detinue 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 detinue's complaint of non-supply of document has to be supported by prejudice caused to him in making an effective



H.C.P.No.2087 of 2025

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.M.P.No.62/Goonda/2025 dated **25.07.2025**, is hereby set aside. The detainee, viz., Muruganantham, S/o.Ramu, aged 24 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.



H.C.P.No.2087 of 2025

(N.S.K,J.,) (M.J.R,J.,)

24.11.2025

WEB COPY

Index: Yes / No

Internet: Yes / No

ar

To:

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,
Fort St.George, Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Office of the District Magistrate and Collector,
Tiruppur District, Tiruppur.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Superintendent of Police,
Tiruppur District.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison at Coimbatore,
Gandhipuram, Coimbatore.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Komaramangalam Police Station
Tiruppur District.
6. The Joint Secretary to Government
Public (Law & Order),
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.
7. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.
AND



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2087 of 2025

M.JOTHIRAMAN, J.

ar

H.C.P.No.2087 of 2025

24.11.2025