



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 13.07.2021

Coram

The Honourable Mr. Justice P.N.PRAKASH
and
The Honourable Mr. Justice R.PONGIAPPAN

H.C.P.No.2171 of 2020

Rani

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu represented by
The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Vepery,
Chennai - 600 007.

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

4.The Inspector of Police
S-15, Selaiyur Police Station,
Kancheepuram District.

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records pertaining to the order of detention passed in BCDFGISSSV.No.439/2020 dated 23.10.2020 passed by the second respondent and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's son Vinoth @ Chotta Vinoth, son of Subramani, aged about 31 years, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Thenrajan

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj,
: Govt.Advocate
(Crl.Side)



ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by P.N.PRAKASH, J.]

The petitioner is the mother of Vinoth @ Chotta Vinoth, son of Subramani, aged about 31 years, who is the detenu. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in BCDFGISSSV.No.439/2020 dated 23.10.2020, 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 Government Advocate (Crl.Side) 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 seizure mahazar pertaining to the third adverse case has not been translated in vernacular language. He further submitted that the detaining authority, while detaining the detenu, has not furnished the legible copies of the documents relied on by him. This deprived the detenu from making effective representation. Therefore, on these grounds, the detention order is liable to be quashed.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) strongly opposed the habeas corpus petition by filing his counter.

5. On consideration of the submissions made on either side and upon perusal of the documents available on record especially Page No.223 of the booklet, it is clear that the seizure mahazar pertaining to the third adverse case has not been 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 BCDFGISSSV.No.439/2020 dated 23.10.2020, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Vinoth @ Chotta Vinoth, son of Subramani, aged about 31 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

nsd



To

1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Vepery,
Chennai - 600 007.

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

4.The Inspector of Police
S-15, Selaiyur Police Station,
Kancheepuram District.

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.2171 of 2020

RLD (CO)
PR (20/07/2021)