



HCP.No.1232/2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 07.11.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR . JUSTICE S.S.SUNDAR

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.1232/2023

C.Sumathi

..

Petitioner

Versus

- 1.The Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat, Fort St George, Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate
Kallakurichi District, Kallakurichi.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police
Kallakurichi, Kallakurichi District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison-Cuddalore
Cuddalore District.



HCP.No.1232/2023

5.The Inspector of Police
Kachirayapalayam Police Station
Kallakurichi District.

.. Respondents

Prayer:- Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for a Writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the entire records relating to the petitioner's husband detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order dated 07.06.2023 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein made in proceedings Memo.D.O.No.C2/13/2023, quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's husband namely Chinnadurai, son of Munusamy, aged 53 years before this Court and set the petitioner's husband at liberty from detention, now the petitioner's husband detained at Central Prison, Cuddalore.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Samkumar

For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor
assisted by Mr.Aravind.C

O R D E R

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

(1)The petitioner, wife of the detenu Chinnadurai, aged 53 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 07.06.2023 slapped on her husband branding him as "Bootlegger" under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].



HCP.No.1232/2023

WEB COPY

(2) Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional

Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

(3) Though several points have been raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner, it is stated that the detention order is liable to be quashed on the ground that the detenu was not furnished with the vernacular version of the Remand Order, which document was relied upon by the Detaining Authority to arrive at the subjective satisfaction about the possibility of the detenu's release on bail. Hence, it is submitted that the non-translation of the vital document deprives the detenu of making effective representation against the detention order to the authorities concerned.

(4) It is seen that in page No.106 of the Booklet furnished to the detenu, wherein the document pertaining to the Remand Order in the ground case, it is seen that the said document is only in English version and no vernacular translation of the said document is provided in the Booklet. Non furnishing of the vernacular version of the vital document would deprive the detenu of making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention.



HCP.No.1232/2023

WEB COPY

(5) In this context, it is useful to refer to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Powanammal Vs. State of Tamil Nadu*** reported in ***(1999) 2 SCC 413***. The Hon'ble Supreme Court had occasion to deal with similar situation where in the Grounds of Detention referred to an order remanding the detenu therein to judicial custody was in English language. Since the tamil version of the document was not supplied to the detenu therein, a specific issue was raised by the Hon'ble Supreme Court whether failure to supply tamil version of the remand order passed in English, a language not known to the detenu therein, would vitiate the detenu's further detention. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, after discussing the safeguards embodied in Article 22[5] of the Constitution, observed that the detenu should be afforded an opportunity of making representation effectively against the Detention Order and that, the failure to supply every material in the language which can be understood by the detenu, is imperative. In the said context, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held in Paragraphs 9 and 16 as follows:

"9. However, this Court has maintained a distinction between a document which has been relied



HCP.No.1232/2023

upon by the detaining authority in the grounds of detention and a document which finds a mere reference in the grounds of detention. Whereas the non-supply of a copy of the document relied upon in the grounds of detention has been held to be fatal to continued detention, the detenu need not show that any prejudice is caused to him. This is because the non-supply of such a document would amount to denial of the right of being communicated the grounds and of being afforded the opportunity of making an effective representation against the order. But it would not be so where the document merely finds a reference in the order of detention or among the grounds thereof. In such a case, the detenu's complaint of non-supply of document has to be supported by prejudice caused to him in making an effective representation. What applies to a document would equally apply to furnishing a translated copy of the document in the language known to and understood by the detenu, should the document be in a different language.

.....

16. *For the above reasons, in our view, the non-supply of the Tamil version of the English document,*



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1232/2023

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."

(6) Thus, the detention order is vitiated due to non-furnishing of the vernacular version of the vital document and hence, the same is liable to be quashed.

(7) In view of the aforesaid reason, the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 07.06.2023 in Memo.D.O.No.C2/13/2023 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless he is required in connection with any other case.

[SSSRJ] [SMJ]
07.11.2023

AP
Internet : Yes



HCP.No.1232/2023

To
WEB COPY

- 1.The Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat, Fort St George, Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate
Kallakurichi District, Kallakurichi.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police
Kallakurichi, Kallakurichi District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison-Cuddalore
Cuddalore District.
- 5.The Inspector of Police
Kachirayapalayam Police Station
Kallakurichi District.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1232/2023

S.S.SUNDAR, J.,
AND
SUNDER MOHAN, J.,

AP

H.C.P.No.1232/2023

07.11.2023