



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.845 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11.09.2023

Coram

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE **M.SUNDAR**
and
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE **R.SAKTHIVEL**

H.C.P.No.845 of 2023

Kavimanju

.. Petitioner/
Wife of the detenu

VS

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

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate
Vellore District, Vellore - 9

3. The Superintendent of Police
Vellore District, Vellore-9

4. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Vellore-2

5. The Inspector of Police
Vellore South Crime Police Station
Vellore District

.. Respondents

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 09.05.2023 in



H.C.P.No.845 of 2023

C3/D.O.No.38/2023 against the petitioner husband Senthilkumar @ Manda Senthilkumar, male, aged 37 years, son of Rajendran, who is confined at Central Prison, Vellore and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Balaji

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

ORDER

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

This 'Habeas Corpus Petition' ['HCP' for the sake of brevity] has been filed by wife of the detenu assailing a 'preventive detention order dated 09.05.2023 bearing reference C3/D.O.No.38/2023' [hereinafter 'impugned preventive detention order' for the sake of brevity and convenience]. To be noted, fifth respondent is the sponsoring authority and second respondent is the detaining authority as impugned preventive detention order has been made by second respondent.

2. Impugned detention order has been made under '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



H.C.P.No.845 of 2023

(Tamil Nadu Act No.14 of 1982)' [hereinafter 'Act 14 of 1982' for the sake of convenience and clarity] on the premise that the detenu is a 'Goonda' within the meaning of Section 2(f) of Act 14 of 1982.

3. There are three adverse cases and one ground case. The ground case which constitutes substantial part of the impugned preventive detention order is Crime No.08 of 2023 on the file of Vellore South Crime Police Station for alleged offences under Sections 341, 294(b), 392 and 506(ii) of 'Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Act 45 of 1860)' ['IPC' for brevity]. Considering the nature of the challenge to the impugned detention order, it is not necessary to delve into the facts of the case.

4. Mr.D.Balaji, learned Senior counsel appearing on behalf of counsel on record for petitioner and Mr.E.Raj Thilak, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor for all respondents are before us.

5. Though very many grounds have been raised in the support affidavit, Mr.D.Balaji, learned counsel on record for petitioner at the hearing projected his argument qua challenge to the impugned preventive detention order on one point and that one point turns on not providing of translated copy of a document (relied on by the detaining authority) in a language which the detenu is conversant with. Elaborating on the above submission,



learned counsel drew our attention to page Nos.120 and 121 of the booklet which is bail petition pertaining to the detenu in the ground case. No Tamil translation of this document has been furnished to the detenu.

6. We had the benefit of perusing the booklet. We also noticed that bail petition in the ground case forms part of the ground on which the impugned detention order has been made. As this turns on obtaining scenario which comes to light from the booklet which is before us, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor does not have much of a say.

7. Be that as it may, we are informed that the literacy level of the detenu is VIII Standard and he is a school drop out. We are also informed that the detenu is conversant only with Tamil. We remind ourselves of Powanammal case i.e., ***Powanammal Vs. State of Tamil Nadu***, wherein Hon'ble Supreme Court addressed itself to this translation point in a similar fact situation. The question which the Hon'ble Supreme Court addressed itself to 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



WEB COPY

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. '

8. We find that the aforementioned **Powanammal** case applies in all fours to the case on hand as we find that bail petition in the ground case which has been relied on as part of the grounds of detention qua impugned preventive detention order is a crucial document and not furnishing the same in Tamil the lone language known to the detenu has impaired his constitutional right to make an effective representation qua impugned preventive detention order. We therefore have no hesitation in saying that the impugned preventive detention order deserves to be dislodged.

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



H.C.P.No.845 of 2023

10. Apropos, the sequitur is, captioned HCP is allowed. Impugned preventive detention order dated 09.05.2023 bearing reference C3/D.O.No.38/2023 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Senthilkumar @ Manda Senthilkumar male, aged 37 years, Son of Thiru.Rajendran, 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.)
11.09.2023

Index : Yes

Neutral Citation : Yes

GPA

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



H.C.P.No.845 of 2023

To

WEB COPY

1. The Secretary to the Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat
Chennai – 600 009
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate
Vellore District, Vellore - 9
3. The Superintendent of Police
Vellore District, Vellore-9
4. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Vellore-2
5. The Inspector of Police
Vellore South Crime Police Station
Vellore District
6. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.845 of 2023

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

gpa

H.C.P.No.845 of 2023

11.09.2023