



WEB COPY



HCP.No.349 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 25.06.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.349 of 2024

Amutha

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.

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

3.The Inspector of Police,
Team-33, Forgery Investigation Wing,
Central Crime Branch,
Chennai.

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

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to



HCP.No.349 of 2024

issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records of the detention order made in BCDFGISSSV.No.60/2024 dated 24.01.2024 passed by the Commissioner of Police, Greater Chennai the second respondent herein and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detainee before the Hon'ble Court and set the detainee Thiru.Ramu, S/o.Karuppannan aged 46 years now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Sudharsan
For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the wife of the detenu namely Ramu, aged about 46 years, S/o. Karuppannan, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 24.01.2024 slapped on her husband, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas,



HCP.No.349 of 2024

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 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 page nos.120 to 137 in the booklet has not been properly translated in Tamil. Further, the detenu has passed only 10th standard and 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 Nos.120 to 137, this Court finds that the contents therein have not been properly 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 Detaining Authority to arrive at a subjective satisfaction, would deprive the detenu of his valuable



HCP.No.349 of 2024

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 the grounds of detention has been held to be fatal to continued detention, the detenu need not show that



WEB COPY



HCP.No.349 of 2024

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. 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



HCP.No.349 of 2024

order is liable to be quashed.

WEB COPY

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 24.01.2024 in No.60/BCDFGISSSV/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Ramu, aged about 46 years, S/o. Karuppannan, 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]

25.06.2024

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Tsg



HCP.No.349 of 2024

WEB COPY

To

1. Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.

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

3. The Inspector of Police,
Team-33, Forgery Investigation Wing,
Central Crime Branch,
Chennai.

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

5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.349 of 2024

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

Tsg

H.C.P.No.349 of 2024

25.06.2024