

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 28.08.2019

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.M.SUNDRESH
AND
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

H.C.P.NO.1175 OF 2019

Ranjith @ Kozhi Ranjith

.. Petitioner

Vs

1. The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
2. Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for a writ of habeas corpus, to call for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the second respondent dated 14.05.2019 in Memo No.248/BCDFGISSSV/2019 against the petitioner Ranjith @ Kozhi Ranjith, male, aged 24 years, S/o.Manickavel, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal II, Chennai and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Senthilvel

For Respondents : Ms.V.Saradha Devi
Govt.Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by M.M.SUNDRESH, J.)

The detenu himself is the petitioner. He has come up with this habeas corpus petition, challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent, vide Memo No.248/BCDFGISSSV/2019 dated 14.05.2019, branding him as a "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic

Offenders, Sand Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].

2. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondents and we have also perused the records carefully.

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 detaining authority, while detaining the detenu, has not furnished the legible copy of the document relied on by him and the remand order has not been properly translated in vernacular language. This deprived the detenu from making effective representation. Therefore, on this sole ground, the detention order is liable to be quashed.

4. On consideration of the submissions made on either side and upon perusal of the documents available on record, especially Page No.8 of the booklet, it is clear that the detaining authority, by providing illegible copy of the document, has taken away the rights of detenu to effectively defend himself against his detention. Apart from that, the remand order has not been properly translated in vernacular language. Thus the impugned detention order is liable to be set aside on this ground.

5. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Memo No.248/BCDFGISSSV/2019 dated 14.05.2019 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Ranjith @ Kozhi Ranjith, male, aged 24 years, S/o.Manickavel, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

सत्यमेव जयते
Sd/-

Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

WEB COPY
Sub Assistant Registrar

mmi/ssm

To

1. The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.
3. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.
4. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law & Order) Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-104.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.1175 of 2019

VSNI (CO)
CS/10/10/2019



WEB COPY