



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2024 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 07.11.2025

C O R A M

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN

H.C.P.No.2024 of 2025

Fathimabeevi

... Petitioner/Detenue's Wife

-VS-

1. The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai Commissionerate,
Chennai.
3. The Superintendent,
Central Prison-II, Puzhal,
Chennai – 600 066.
4. The Inspector of Police,
D-5, Marina Police Station,
Chennai. ... Respondents

Prayer: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the order of Detention bearing No.397/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 23.06.2025 on the file of the second respondent and directing the respondents to produce the petitioner's husband Mr.Raji @ Light House Raji S/o Desamuthu Male aged about 34 years and



H.C.P.No.2024 of 2025

now confined at Central Prison-II Chennai before this Honble Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Thirumaran

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

ORDER

The petitioner herein, who is the wife of the detenue, namely, Raji @ Light House Raji, S/o.Desamuthu, male, aged about 34 years, detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai has come forward with this petition, challenging the detention order dated 23.06.2025, passed by the second respondent in No.397/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.

3. Though several points have been raised by the learned



H.C.P.No.2024 of 2025

counsel for the petitioner, it is stated that the detention order is liable to be quashed on the ground that the detinue was furnished with illegible copy at Page No.149 of the booklet (Vol.II). Hence, it is submitted that the detinue was deprived of making effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that Page No.149 of the Booklet (Vol.II) furnished to the detinue, is illegible. This furnishing of illegible copy of the vital document would deprive the detinue of making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention.

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 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



H.C.P.No.2024 of 2025

Paragraphs 9 and 16 {as in SCC journal} as follows:

WEB COPY

“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 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.”

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



H.C.P.No.2024 of 2025

order is liable to be quashed.

WEB COPY

7. For the aforesaid reasons, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the Detention Order passed by the Second Respondent in No.397/BCDFGISSSV/2025 dated 23.06.2025 is hereby set aside. The detainee, viz., Raji @ Light House Raji, S/o.Desamuthu, male, aged about 34 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.)
07.11.2025

Index: Yes / No
Internet: Yes / No
ar

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.
AND
M.JOTHIRAMAN, J.
ar



H.C.P.No.2024 of 2025

To:

1. The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai Commissionerate,
Chennai.
3. The Superintendent,
Central Prison-II, Puzhal,
Chennai – 600 066.
4. The Inspector of Police,
D-5, Marina Police Station,
Chennai.
5. The Joint Secretary to Government
Public (Law & Order),
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.2024 of 2025

07.11.2025