



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.753 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 08.09.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **M.SUNDAR**  
and  
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **R.SAKTHIVEL**

**H.C.P.No.753 of 2023**

Mrs.M.Jayalakshmi

.. Petitioner

Vs

1. The State of Tamil Nadu  
Rep. by its Secretary  
Prohibition & Excise Department  
Fort St.George  
Chennai-600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police  
Avadi Police Commissionerate  
Avadi, Chennai – 600 054
3. The Superintendent of Police  
Central Prison  
Puzhal, Chennai-600 066
4. The Inspector of Police  
M-2 Milk Colony Police Station  
MMC, Chennai – 600 051

.. Respondents



H.C.P.No.753 of 2023

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus to call for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the second respondent dated 16.03.2023 in No.67/BCDFGISSSV/2023 against the petitioner's son M.Aravindhan, aged about 22 years, who is now confined in the Central Prison, Puzhal in pursuance of the detention order 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.Venkatesan  
for Mr.R.Arunkumar

For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak  
Additional Public Prosecutor

### **O R D E R**

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

When the captioned 'Habeas Corpus Petition' (hereinafter 'HCP' for the sake of convenience and clarity) was listed in the Admission Board on 12.06.2023, the following order was made:

**'H.C.P.No.753 of 2023**

**M.SUNDAR, J.,**

**and**

**K.GOVINDARAJAN THILAKAVADI, J.,**

***[Order of the Court was made by M.SUNDAR. J]***

*Ms.S.Shivashankari, learned counsel representing the counsel*



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.753 of 2023

on record for petitioner is before us. Learned counsel on behalf of counsel on record for petitioner expresses regret for not representing the matter on 01.06.2023. To be noted, there was one more listing on 05.06.2023 wherein adjournment was sought.

2. Be that as it may, captioned Habeas Corpus Petition has been filed in this Court on 12.04.2023 inter alia assailing a detention order dated 16.03.2023 bearing reference 67/BCDFGISSSV/2023 made by 'second respondent' [hereinafter 'Detaining Authority' for the sake of convenience and clarity]. To be noted, fourth respondent is the Sponsoring Authority.

3. To be noted, mother of the detenu is the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that ground case qua the detenu is for alleged offences under Sections 341, 294(b), 336, 427, 392, 397 and 506(ii) of 'Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Act 45 of 1860)' ['IPC' for brevity] in Crime No.95 of 2023 on the file of M-2 Madhavaram Milk Colony Police Station.

5. The aforementioned detention order has been made on the premise that the detenu is a 'Goonda' 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 No.14 of 1982)' [hereinafter 'Act 14 of 1982' for the sake of convenience and clarity].

6. The detention order has been assailed inter alia on the ground that some of the pages in the grounds booklet furnished to the



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.753 of 2023

*detenu are illegible which prevented the detenu from making an effective representation.*

*7. Prima facie case made out for admission. Admit. Issue Rule nisi returnable by four weeks.*

*8. Mr.R.Muniyapparaj, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, State of Tamil Nadu accepts notice for all respondents. List the captioned Habeas Corpus Petition accordingly.'*

2. The aforementioned Admission Board captures all essentials that are imperative for appreciating this order and therefore, we are not setting out the same again. However, short forms, short references and abbreviations used in the Admission Board order will continue to be used in the instant order also for the sake of brevity, convenience and clarity.

3. Mr.S.Venkatesan, learned counsel representing the counsel on record for petitioner and Mr.E.Raj Thilak, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for all the respondents are before us.



H.C.P.No.753 of 2023

4. To be noted, 'order dated 16.03.2023 bearing reference No.67/BCDFGISSSV/2023' made by second respondent / Detaining Authority shall in this order be referred to as 'impugned preventive detention order' for the sake of convenience and clarity.

5. As would be evident from paragraph 6 of the Admission Board order, at the time of admission, learned counsel for petitioner predicated his challenge to the impugned preventive detention order on the point that some of the pages in the grounds booklet furnished to the detenu are illegible which prevented the detenu from making an effective representation but in the final hearing Board today, learned counsel predicated his campaign against the impugned preventive detention order on the ground that the subjective satisfaction arrived at by the Detaining Authority qua imminent possibility of detenu being released on bail is impaired.

6. Elaborating on the aforementioned point on subjective satisfaction, learned counsel for petitioner drew our attention to a portion of paragraph 4 of the impugned preventive detention order which reads as follows:

*'4...In a similar case registered at under section*



*294(b), 341, 323, 397, 336, 427 and 506(ii) IPC, in J-4 Kotturpuram Police Station Crime No.43/2018, the bail was granted by the Court of Principal Sessions Judge at Chennai in Crl.M.P.No.1759/2018. Hence, I infer that it is very likely of his coming out on bail in M-2 Madhavaram Milk Colony Police Station Crime No.76/2023 and 95/2023, since in a similar case, the bail was granted by the court after a lapse of time...'*

7. Thereafter, learned counsel placed before us the grounds booklet as served on the detenu and drew our attention to page Nos.125 to 128 thereat which contain **Aravind case** bail order (similar case) made in English by the learned Sessions Judge and what according to the Detaining Authority is Tamil translation version of the same i.e., **Aravind case** bail order. A perusal of the bail order in English and the Tamil translated version brings to light that the bail order in English refers to pending cases against the petitioner with specificity as regards calendar years in paragraph (6) but in the Tamil translation, the same is missing.

8. Learned Prosecutor in response to the above argument submitted that only mentioning of the calendar years of pending cases with specificity



H.C.P.No.753 of 2023

is missing, the same is clerical error but otherwise the translation is largely correct.

9. We carefully considered the rival submissions. We find from the confession statement of the detenu at page Nos. 80 to 82 of the grounds booklet that the literacy level of the detenu is X Standard in School. Therefore, it is not merely a case of improper translation it is also a case of giving orders with different contents in English and Tamil version which can baffle a person whose literacy level is only X Standard in School. This means that (when a detenu is baffled), his right to make an effective representation against the impugned preventive detention order gets impaired.

10. We also remind ourselves of Powanammal case i.e., ***Powanammal Vs. State of Tamil Nadu***, wherein Hon'ble Supreme Court addressed to itself this translation point in a similar fact situation. The question which the Hon'ble Supreme Court addressed to itself is captured in paragraph 6 and the manner in which a Hon'ble Bench of the Supreme Court answered this question is captured in paragraph 16. To be noted,



H.C.P.No.753 of 2023

**Powanammal** case is reported in (1999) 2 SCC 413 and paragraphs 6 and

16 {as in SCC journal} read as follows:

*'6.The short question that falls for our consideration is whether failure to supply the Tamil version of the order of remand passed in English, a language not known to the detenue, would vitiate her further detention.*

*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 detenue be set free forthwith unless she is required to be detained in any other case. The appeal is accordingly allowed. '*

11. Therefore, this is a case of improper translation as well as providing documents with different contents in two different languages impairing the detenu's right to make an effective representation. The net sequitur is, the impugned preventive detention order is vitiated and the same deserves to be dislodged.



H.C.P.No.753 of 2023

12. Before concluding, we also remind ourselves that preventive detention is not a punishment and HCP is a high prerogative writ.

13. Ergo, the sequitur is, captioned HCP is allowed. Impugned preventive detention order dated 16.03.2023 bearing reference No.67/BCDFGISSSV/2023 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Aravindhan, male, aged 22 years, son of Thiru.Madhavan, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, if not required in connection with any other case / cases. There shall be no order as to costs.

(M.S.,J.)

(R.S.V.,J.)

08.09.2023

Index : Yes

Internet : Yes

Neutral Citation : Yes

*gpa*

**P.S: Registry to forthwith communicate this order to Jail authorities in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.**



*H.C.P.No.753 of 2023*

To

WEB COPY

1. The Secretary to Government  
Prohibition & Excise Department  
Fort St.George  
Chennai-600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police  
Avadi Police Commissionerate  
Avadi, Chennai – 600 054
3. The Superintendent of Police  
Central Prison  
Puzhal, Chennai.
4. The Inspector of Police  
M-2 Milk Colony Police Station  
MMC, Chennai – 600 051
5. The Public Prosecutor,  
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



*H.C.P.No.753 of 2023*

**M.SUNDAR, J.,  
and  
R.SAKTHIVEL, J.,**

*gpa*

H.C.P.No.753 of 2023

08.09.2023

Page Nos.11/11