



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 23.11.2021

Coram

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH
and
THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE R.HEMALATHA

H.C.P.No.1052 of 2021

Kannagi
W/o.Vinayagam

.. Petitioner/Mother of the
detenu

Vs.

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Chennai.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai - 600 066.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Crime,
E-1 Mylapore Police Station,
Chennai.

.. Respondents

Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the second respondent dated 22.04.2021 in No.111/BCDFGISSSV/2021 against the petitioner's son Ragul @ Yamaha Ragul s/o.Vinayagam, aged 27 years, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai and to set aside the same and consequently, direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Kannan

For Respondents: Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor



ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by R.HEMALATHA, J]

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu viz., Ragul @ Yamaha Ragul s/o.Vinayagam, aged 27 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in No.111/BCDFGISSSV/2021 dated 22.04.2021, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) of the 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. We have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.

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 remand extension order pertaining to the ground case has not been properly translated in vernacular language. This deprived the detenu from making effective representation. Therefore, on these grounds, 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.421 and 423 of the booklet, it is clear that the remand extension order pertaining to the ground case has not been properly translated in vernacular language. Thus, the impugned detention order is liable to be set aside on this ground.

In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in No.111/BCDFGISSSV/2021 dated 22.04.2021 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Ragul @ Yamaha Ragul s/o.Vinayagam, aged 27 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS VII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

gm



To

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

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Chennai.

3. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai - 600 066.

4. The Inspector of Police,
Crime,
E-1 Mylapore Police Station,
Chennai.

5. The Joint Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Public, Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.

6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.1052 of 2021

MG(CO)
KM(24/11/2021)