



H.C.P.No.703 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 14.08.2023

CORAM

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

H.C.P.No.703 of 2023

Nandini

.. Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Tamil Nadu re. By its
Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai -9.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Avadi City, Chennai.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
T-2 Ambattur Estate Police Station,
Chennai.
- 4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus to call for the entire records relating to the petitioner's husband's detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order dated 03.03.2023 on the file of the second respondent herein made in proceedings No.58/BCDFGISSSV/2023, quash the same as illegal and



H.C.P.No.703 of 2023

consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's husband namely Manikandan, aged 25 years, son of Palani, before this Court and set him at liberty, now the petitioner's husband is detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai – 66.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Nirmal Krishnan
for Mr.C.C.Chellappan

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

ORDER

[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 28.04.2023, the following order was made:

H.C.P.No.703 of 2023
M.SUNDAR, J.,
and
M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.,

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

Captioned Habeas Corpus Petition has been filed in this Court on 24.04.2023 inter alia assailing a detention order dated 03.03.2023 bearing reference No.58/BCDFGISSSV/2023 made by 'second respondent' [hereinafter 'Detaining Authority' for the sake of convenience and clarity]. To be noted, third respondent is the Sponsoring Authority.

2. Wife of detenu is the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.703 of 2023

the ground case qua the detenu is for alleged offences under Sections 341, 294(b), 323, 427, 392 and 506(ii) of 'The Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860)' [hereinafter 'IPC' for the sake of convenience and clarity] in Crime No.41 of 2023 on the file of T-2 Ambattur Estate Police Station.

4. 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].

5. The detention order has been assailed inter alia on the ground that some of the pages in the grounds booklet furnished to the detenu are in English which prevented the detenu from making an effective representation.

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

7. 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.



H.C.P.No.703 of 2023

3. Mr.G.Nirmal Krishnan, 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.

4. To be noted, 'order dated 03.03.2023 bearing reference No.58/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 5 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 in English which prevented the detenu from making an effective representation, however in the final hearing 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.



H.C.P.No.703 of 2023

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 there is a real possibility of his coming out on bail in T-14 Mangadu Police Station Crime Nos.26/2023, 68/2023 and 108/2023 cases by filing bail application before the appropriate court, 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.126 to 129 thereat wherein *Aravind's* case bail order (similar case) made in English by the learned Sessions Judge and what according to the Detaining Authority's Tamil translation version were furnished to the detenu. On a perusal of the bail order in English and the Tamil translated version brings to light that the bail

Page Nos.5/10



H.C.P.No.703 of 2023

order in English refers to pending cases against the petitioner with specificity as regards years in paragraph 6 but in the Tamil translation the same is missing.

8. Learned Prosecutor in response to the above arguments submitted that only the mentioning of the years of pending cases with specificity is missing 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.82 to 84 of the grounds booklet that the literacy level of the detenu is only 9th 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 9th 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.,



H.C.P.No.703 of 2023

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, **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. '



H.C.P.No.703 of 2023

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.

12. Ergo, the sequitur is, captioned HCP is allowed. Impugned preventive detention order dated 03.03.2023 bearing reference No.58/BCDFGISSSV/2023 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Manikandan, aged 25 years, Son of Thiru.Palani, 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.)
14.08.2023

Index : Yes

Neutral Citation : Yes

mmi

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

To

Page Nos.8/10



H.C.P.No.703 of 2023

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai -9.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Avadi City, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police,
T-2 Ambattur Estate Police Station,
Chennai.
4. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.703 of 2023

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

mmi

H.C.P.No.703 of 2023

14.08.2023

Page Nos.10/10