



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1399 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 11.12.2023

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.S. SUNDAR

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.1399 of 2023

Neela

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by the Additional Chief Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.

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

3.The Inspector of Police,
G-1, Vepery Police Station,
Chennai.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison-II,
Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.

... Respondents



H.C.P.No.1399 of 2023

Prayer : Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records relating to the detention order in Memo No.284/BCDFGISSSV/2023, dated 29.06.2023, passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamilnadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondent to produce the petitioner's son Thiru. Krishnakumar @ Subash, S/o. Tamilmani, aged about 23 years, the detenu, now confined in Central prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Honble Court and set the petitioner's son Thiru. Krishnakumar @ Subash, S/o. Tamilmani, aged about 23 years, the detenu herein at liberty.

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner, mother of the detenu Krishnakumar @ Subash, S/o.Tamilmani, aged about 23 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated



H.C.P.No.1399 of 2023

29.06.2023 slapped on her son, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].

2.Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

3.Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the order of Detention passed by the Detaining Authority is vitiated for material irregularities, as the Remand Order dated 16.06.2023 has not been translated correctly to the vernacular language. It is stated that there is incorrect translation pertaining to the date till which the accused was remanded to judicial custody. It is therefore stated that the detenu is deprived of his valuable right to make effective representation.



H.C.P.No.1399 of 2023

WEB COPY

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, in particular, Page No.121, it is seen that, in the Remand Order passed by the II Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai, in G1 Crime No.160 of 2023, dated 16.06.2023, it is stated that the accused was remanded to judicial custody till 30.06.2023. However, in the translated copy of the said order in the vernacular version found at Page No.122 of the Booklet, it is stated as if the accused was remanded to judicial custody till 30.07.2023. Hence, this Court finds that there is an erroneous translation of the Remand Order in the vernacular version.

5. It is in the said circumstances, this Court finds that serious prejudice is caused to the detenu on account of incorrect translation in making effective representation against the Detention Order and that the Detention Order passed by the Detaining Authority is vitiated.

6. 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, 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 in SCC journal} as follows:

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

7.In view of the ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and in view of the aforesaid reasons, this Court is of the view that the detention order is liable to be quashed.

8.Accordingly, the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent in



H.C.P.No.1399 of 2023

No.284/BCDFGISSSV/2023, dated 29.06.2023, is hereby set aside and the

Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu Krishnakumar @ Subash, S/o. Tamilmani, aged about 23 years, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless he is required in connection with any other case.

(S.S.S.R., J.) (S.M., J.)
11.12.2023

mkn

Internet : Yes

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Vepery, Chennai – 600 007.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
G-1, Vepery Police Station,
Chennai.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison-II,
Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.

Page 7 of 9



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1399 of 2023

S.S. SUNDAR, J.
and
SUNDER MOHAN, J.

mkn

5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.1399 of 2023



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1399 of 2023

11.12.2023