



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2660 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.06.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.SUNDAR
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SAKTHIVEL

H.C.P.No.2660 of 2022

Rani

.. Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.State of Tamil Nadu rep. By
The Secretary,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District
Collector, Thiruvallur District, Thiruvallur.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Thiruvallur District, Thiruvallur.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
R.K.Pet Police Circle, Thiruvallur District.
- 5.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison II,
Puzhal, Chennai – 66.

.. 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
relating to the detention order passed in Memo

Page Nos.1/8



H.C.P.No.2660 of 2022

No.59/BCDFGISSSV/2022 dated 01.12.2022 by the second respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's son Thiru.Chakkravarthi @ Mithun, S/o.Allimuthu, aged about 35 years, the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set the petitioner's son Thiru.Chakkravarthi @ Mithun, S/o.Allimuthu, aged about 35 years, the detenu herein at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Lingakumar
For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor

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 mother of the detenu assailing a 'preventive detention order dated 01.12.2022 bearing reference BCDFGISSSV No.59/2022' [hereinafter 'impugned preventive detention order' for the sake of convenience and brevity]. To be noted, fourth respondent is the sponsoring authority and second respondent is the detaining authority as impugned preventive detention order has been made by second respondent.



H.C.P.No.2660 of 2022

WEB COPY

2. Impugned preventive 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 is no adverse case. The ground case which is the sole substratum of the impugned preventive detention order is Crime No.149 of 2022 on the file of Pallipet Police Station for alleged offences under Sections 8(c), 20(b)(ii)(B) of 'Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985' (hereinafter 'NDPS Act' for the sake of convenience and clarity) r/w 328 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 preventive detention order, it is not necessary to delve into the factual matrix or be detained further by facts.



H.C.P.No.2660 of 2022

4. Mr.R.Lingakumar, learned counsel on record for petitioner and Mr.E.Raj Thilak, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor for all respondents are before us.

5. In the support affidavit qua captioned HCP, several grounds have been raised/urged but **in the final hearing today**, learned counsel for petitioner projected his argument in his challenge against the impugned preventive detention order on the point that translated copy of a document relied on by the detaining authority in a language which the detenu is conversant with, has not been furnished to the detenu. Elaborating on the submission, learned counsel drew our attention to page No.16 of the booklet which is the arrest intimation form. No Tamil translation of this form has been furnished to the detenu. We had the benefit of perusing the booklet. We also noticed that the arrest intimation form forms part of the ground on which the impugned preventive detention order has been made.

6. As this turns on obtaining facts which are before us learned State Additional Public Prosecutor does not have much of a say.



H.C.P.No.2660 of 2022

7. Be that as it may we are informed that the literacy level of the detenu is 10th 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**. The question which the Honourable Bench of the Supreme Court addressed to itself in a similar fact situation is captured in paragraph 6 and the manner in which a Honourable 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.2660 of 2022

8. 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 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 the impugned preventive detention order. We therefore have no hesitation in saying that the impugned preventive detention order deserves to be dislodged.

9. Apropos, the sequitur is, captioned HCP is allowed. Impugned preventive detention order dated 01.12.2022 bearing reference BCDFGISSSV No.59/2022 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Chakkravarthi @ Mithun, aged 35 years, son of Thiru. Allimuthu 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.)
27.06.2023

Index : Yes
Neutral Citation : Yes
mmi

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

Page Nos.6/8



H.C.P.No.2660 of 2022

To

WEB COPY

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District
Collector, Thiruvallur District,
Thiruvallur.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Thiruvallur District, Thiruvallur.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
R.K.Pet Police Circle,
Thiruvallur District.
- 5.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison II,
Puzhal, Chennai – 66.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2660 of 2022

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

mmi

H.C.P.No.2660 of 2022

27.06.2023

Page Nos.8/8