



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1794 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 20.03.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **M.SUNDAR**
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **N.ANAND VENKATESH**

H.C.P.No.1794 of 2022

Narmatha
W/o.Easter Joy

.. Petitioner /
Wife of detenu

Vs

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Department of Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate
Kallakurichi District
Kallakurichi
3. The Superintendent of Police
Kallakurichi District
Kallakurichi
4. The Superintendent of Police
Central Prison
Cuddalore
5. The Inspector of Police
Kachirayapalayam Police Station
Kallakurichi District

.. Respondents



H.C.P.No.1794 of 2022

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus to call for the records made in D.O.No.C2/38/2022 dated 15.08.2022 on the file of second respondent herein and quash the same as illegal and direct the respondents to produce the detenu Thiru. Easter Joy, son of Daniel, aged 33 years, now confined at Central Prison Cuddalore before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Sankarasubbu
for Mr.A.Ramesh

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor
Assisted by
Mr.N.Narkeeran, Advocate

ORDER

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

Captioned 'Habeas Corpus Petition' ['HCP' for the sake of brevity] has been filed by wife of detenu assailing a 'preventive detention order dated 15.08.2022 bearing reference D.O.C2/38/2022 [hereinafter 'impugned detention order' for the sake of convenience and brevity]. To be noted, fifth respondent is the sponsoring authority and second respondent is the detaining authority as impugned detention order has been made by second respondent.



H.C.P.No.1794 of 2022

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 (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 is no adverse case. The ground case which is the sole substratum of the impugned detention order is Crime No.201 of 2022 on the file of Kachirayapalaram Police Station, which was initially registered as 'Boy Missing' and subsequently altered to Sections 364(A), 344, 120(B) and 506(ii) of 'The Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860)' [hereinafter 'IPC' for the sake of convenience and clarity]. Owing to the nature of the challenge to the impugned detention order, it is not necessary to delve into the factual matrix or be detained further by facts.



H.C.P.No.1794 of 2022

4. Mr.R.Sankarasubbu, learned counsel representing the counsel on record for petitioner and Mr.R.Muniyapparaj, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor assisted by Mr.N.Narkeeran for all respondents are before us.

5. Though very many grounds have been raised in the support affidavit, learned counsel for petitioner at the hearing projected his argument qua challenge to the impugned detention order on one point and that point is not providing translated copy of a document (relied on by the detaining authority) in a language which the detenu is conversant with. Elaborating on the submission, learned counsel drew our attention to page 79 of the booklet which is the Remand Order. No Tamil translation of this Remand Order has been furnished to the detenu. We had the benefit of perusing the booklet. We also noticed that Remand Order 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.



H.C.P.No.1794 of 2022

6. Be that as it may, we are informed that the literacy level of the detenu is 8th standard in school 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 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.1794 of 2022

WEB COPY

7. In the case on hand, we find that Remand Order which has been relied on as part of the grounds of detention qua impugned detention order is a crucial document and not furnishing translation of the same in Tamil the lone language known to the detenu has impaired his constitutional right to make an effective representation qua the impugned detention order. We therefore have no hesitation in saying that the impugned detention order deserves to be dislodged.

8. Ergo, the sequitur is, captioned HCP is allowed. Impugned detention order dated 15.08.2022 bearing reference D.O.No.C2/38/2022 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Easter Joy, male, aged 33 years, son of Mr.Daniel 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.)

(N.A.V.,J.)

20.03.2023

Index : Yes

Neutral Citation : Yes

gpa

P.S: Registry to forthwith communicate this order to Jail

Page Nos.6/8



H.C.P.No.1794 of 2022

authorities in Central Prison, Cuddalore.

WEB COPY

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
Department of Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai -9.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate
Kallakurichi District
Kallakurichi
3. The Superintendent of Police
Kallakurichi District
Kallakurichi
4. The Superintendent of Police
Central Prison
Cuddalore
5. The Inspector of Police
Kachirayapalayam Police Station
Kallakurichi District
6. The Public Prosecutor
Madras High Court
Chennai



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1794 of 2022

**M.SUNDAR, J.,
and
N.ANAND VENKATESH, J.,**

gpa

H.C.P.No.1794 of 2022

20.03.2023

Page Nos.8/8