

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 28.10.2020

Coram

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice M.M.SUNDRESH
and
The Hon'ble Mr. Justice D.KRISHNAKUMAR

H.C.P. No. 1860 of 2020

Deepa

...Petitioner

-vs-

1. The State of Tamil Nadu rep. by its
Secretary to Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St. George, Chennai 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai
The Commissioner Office,
Vepery, Chennai 600 007
3. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai 600 066.
4. State rep. by its
The Inspector of Police,
F1 Chintadripet Police Station,
Chennai.

...Respondents

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 order in Memo No.736/BCDFGISSSV/2019 dated 31.10.2019 passed by the second respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's husband Balamurugan, the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set the petitioner's husband Balamurugan, son of Sammandham, aged about 39 years the detenu herein set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Baskar

For Respondents : Mr.R.Prathap Kumar,
Addl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by M.M.SUNDRESH, J.]

The petitioner is the wife of Balamurugan, son of Sammandham, aged about 39 years, who is the detenu. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Memo No.736/BCDFGISSSV/2019 dated 31.10.2019, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.

2. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents and we have also perused the records carefully.

3. Though the 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 bail order pertaining to the similar case 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 Nos.743 & 745 of the booklet, it is clear that the bail order pertaining to the similar case 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.736/BCDFGISSSV/2019 dated 31.10.2019 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Balamurugan, son of Sammandham, aged about 39 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//


Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St. George, Chennai 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai
The Commissioner Office,
Vepery, Chennai 600 007
3. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public(Law&Order) Department,
Fort Saint George, Ch-9.
4. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai 600 066.
5. The Inspector of Police,
F1 Chintadripet Police Station,
Chennai.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P. No. 1860 of 2020

GMR (CO)
RV(01/12/2020)



WEB COPY