



WEB COPY



HCP.No.333 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.02.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.333 of 2024

Vikramkumar

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Salem City, Salem District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Salem, Salem District.
- 4.State rep. by its
The Inspector of Police,
Shevapet Police Station,
Salem District.
(Crime No.136/2023)

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records, relating to petitioner's cousin brother detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide



HCP.No.333 of 2024

detention order, dated 23.05.2023 on the file of the 2nd respondent made in proceedings Memo C.M.P.No.45/Goonda/Salem City/2023, quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's cousin brother namely Manju, aged about 33 years, S/o. Madappan, before this Court and set the petitioner's cousin brother at liberty from detention, now the petitioner's cousin brother detained at Central Prison, Salem.

For Petitioner	: Mr.W.Camyles Gandhi
For Respondents	: Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan, Additional Public Prosecutor assisted by Mr.C. Aravind

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the cousin brother of the detenu namely Manju, aged about 33 years, S/o. Madappan, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 23.05.2023 slapped on his cousin brother, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders,



HCP.No.333 of 2024

WEB COPY

Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Sexual Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

3. Though several points have been raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner, it is stated that the detention order is liable to be quashed on the ground that the detenu was furnished with illegible copies of the similar case relied upon by the Detaining Authority to arrive at the subjective satisfaction about the possibility of the detenu's release on bail. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that the copy of the similar case relied upon by the Detaining Authority in its grounds of detention i.e., C.M.P.No.346 of 2019 dated 02.02.2019 passed by the Principal Sessions Judge, Salem, is not clear and the said document is illegible. This furnishing of illegible copy of the vital documents would deprive the



HCP.No.333 of 2024

WEB COPY

detenu of making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention.

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 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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.333 of 2024

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. In view of the ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and



HCP.No.333 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 23.05.2023 in C.M.P.No.45/Goonda/Salem City/2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Manju, aged about 33 years, S/o. Madappan, 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]

27.02.2024

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

Sni



HCP.No.333 of 2024

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Salem City, Salem District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Salem, Salem District.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
Shevapet Police Station,
Salem District.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.333 of 2024

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

Sni

H.C.P.No.333 of 2024

27.02.2024