



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.153 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 07.02.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.153 of 2024

M. Sneha

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition, Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Office of Commissioner of Police,
(Goondas Section), Vepery, Chennai 600 007.

3. The Inspector of Police,
P-3, Vyasarpadi Police Station,
Chennai.

4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying



H.C.P.No.153 of 2024

to issue Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the second respondent dated 26.09.2023 in Memo No.424/BCDFGISSSV/2023 against the petitioner's husband Manimaran, Son of Joseph, aged about 29 years, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For petitioner : Mr.V. Parthiban

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

ORDER

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
SUNDER MOHAN, J.

The petitioner, wife of the detenu namely Manimaran, aged about 29 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent, dated 26.09.2023 slapped on her husband, 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].



H.C.P.No.153 of 2024

WEB COPY

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

3. Though several grounds were raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner, it is stated that the detention order is liable to be quashed on the sole ground that the Remand Order dated 01.09.2023 was improperly translated in the vernacular language.

4. On a perusal of the Remand Order dated 01.09.2023 and the translated version, we find that, there is improper translation in atleast two places. In view of the improper translation, we are of the view that the right of the detenu to make an effective representation as against the impugned order of detention is curtailed.

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



H.C.P.No.153 of 2024

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 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.”

6. Thus, the detention order is vitiated on the ground of improper translation of the Remand Order and hence, the same is liable to be quashed.



H.C.P.No.153 of 2024

WEB COPY

7. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 26.09.2023 in No. 424/BCDFGISSSV/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Manimaran, S/o. Joseph, aged about 29 years, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless he is required in connection with any other case.

(M.S.R., J.) (S.M., J.)
07.02.2024

bga

Internet : Yes

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No



H.C.P.No.153 of 2024

To

WEB COPY

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition, Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Office of Commissioner of Police,
(Goondas Section), Vepery, Chennai 600 007.
3. The Inspector of Police,
P-3, Vyasarpadi Police Station,
Chennai.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
6. The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.153 of 2024

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
SUNDER MOHAN, J.

bga

H.C.P.No.153 of 2024

07.02.2024