



WEB COPY



HCP.No.255 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 29.04.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.255 of 2024

Murugeswari

... Petitioner/wife of the detenue

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. 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-3, Kilpauk Police Station,
Chennai.

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

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the detention order in Memo No.705/BCDFGISSSV/2023 dated 29.12.2023



HCP.No.255 of 2024

passed by the second respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondent to produce the petitioner's husband, Karthick, S/o.Dalayan, aged about 35 years, the detenue, now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set the petitioner's husband at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Muthukumar

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the wife of the detenu namely Karthick, S/o.Dalayan, aged about 35 years, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 29.12.2023 slapped on her husband, branding him as "Drug Offender" 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



HCP.No.255 of 2024

Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].

WEB COPY

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as 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 copy of the confession statement of the Deputy Director (Narcotics), Department of Forensic Science, has not been properly translated. It is therefore stated that the detenu is deprived of his valuable right to make effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, particularly in page No.87, this Court finds that the copy of the confession statement of the Deputy Director (Narcotics), Department of Forensic Science, was in Tamil, however, some portion of the confession statement is in English and the same is not translated in Tamil. Therefore, this Court is of the view that the improper translation of the copy of the vital document relied upon by the



HCP.No.255 of 2024

WEB COPY

Detaining Authority to arrive at a subjective satisfaction, would deprive the detenu of his valuable right to make effective representation. It is in the said circumstances, this Court finds that the Detention Order passed by the Detaining Authority is vitiated.

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, 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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.255 of 2024

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.”*



HCP.No.255 of 2024

WEB COPY

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

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 29.12.2023 in Memo No.705/BCDFGISSSV/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Karthick, S/o.Dalayan, aged about 35 years, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, 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]

29.04.2024

Index: Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Anu



HCP.No.255 of 2024

WEB COPY

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-3, Kilpauk Police Station,
Chennai.

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

5.The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai

6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.255 of 2024

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

Anu

H.C.P.No.255 of 2024

29.04.2024