



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1828 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.1828 of 2022

Kannan

S/o. Ramalingam

..

Petitioner/

Father of the detenu

Vs.

1. State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. By the Secretary
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St, George
Chennai – 600 009
 2. The Commissioner of Police
Tambaram City
Sholonganallur, Chennai – 600 119
 3. The Inspector of Police
T-20, Kanathur Police Station
Chennai
 4. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison-II
Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066
- .. Respondents

Page Nos.1/8



H.C.P.No.1828 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 relating to the detention order passed in Memo No.127/BCDFGISSSV/2022 dated 22.08.2022 by the 2nd respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondent to produce the petitioner's son Thiru.Mohan, son of Kannan, aged about 30 years, the detenu now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner	:	Mr.R.Muthukumar
For Respondents	:	Mr.R.Muniyapparaj Additional Public Prosecutor Assisted by Mr.N.Narkeeran

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 father of detenu assailing a 'preventive detention order dated 22.08.2022 bearing reference Memo No.BCDFGISSSV No.127 of 2022' [hereinafter 'impugned detention order' for the sake of convenience and brevity]. To be noted, third respondent is the sponsoring authority and second respondent is the detaining authority as impugned detention order has been made by second respondent.

Page Nos.2/8



H.C.P.No.1828 of 2022

WEB COPY

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 'Drug Offender' within the meaning of Section 2(e) of Act 14 of 1982.

3. There are three adverse case. The ground case which is the sole substratum of the impugned detention order is Crime No.115 of 2022 on the file of T-20, Kanathur Police Station for alleged offences under Sections 8(c) read with Section 20(b)(ii)(B) and 25 of NDPS Act, 1985. 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.

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



H.C.P.No.1828 of 2022

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 237 of the booklet which is the Arrest Intimation Form. No Tamil translation of this Arrest Intimation Form has been furnished to the detenu. We had the benefit of perusing the booklet. We also noticed that Arrest Intimation Form 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.

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. '

7. In the case on hand, we find that Arrest Intimation Form 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



H.C.P.No.1828 of 2022

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 22.08.2022 bearing reference BCDFGISSSV No. 127 of 2022 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Mohan, male, aged 30 years, son of Thiru. Kannan 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

Speaking

Neutral Citation : Yes

gpa

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

Page Nos.6/8



H.C.P.No.1828 of 2022

To

WEB COPY

1. The Secretary
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St, George
Chennai – 600 009
2. The Commissioner of Police
Tambaram City
Sholonganallur, Chennai – 600 119
3. The Inspector of Police
T-20, Kanathur Police Station
Chennai
4. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison-II
Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066
5. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1828 of 2022

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

gpa

H.C.P.No.1828 of 2022

20.03.2023

Page Nos.8/8