



H.C.P.No.816 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 22.07.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.816 of 2024

Mani .. Petitioner/
Father of the detenue

Versus

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.
 2. The District Magistrate & District Collector,
Tiruppur District,
Tiruppur.
 3. The Superintendent of Police,
Tiruppur,
Tiruppur District.
 4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison - Coimbatore,
Coimbatore District.
 5. State rep. by its
The Inspector of Police,
KANGAYAM Police Station,
Tiruppur District.
- .. Respondents



H.C.P.No.816 of 2024

Prayer : Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the entire records, relating to the petitioner's son detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order, dated 24.03.2024 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein made in proceedings Memo Cr.M.P.No.25/Goonda2024, quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's son namely Jegadish @ Jegadiskumar, S/o.Mani, agd 39 years before this Court and set the petitioner's son at liberty from detention, now the petitioner's son detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore.

For Petitioner : Mr.W.Camyles Gandhi

For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the father of the detenue namely Jegadish alias Jegadiskumar, aged about 39 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 24.03.2024 slapped on his son, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral



H.C.P.No.816 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 have been raised in this Habeas Corpus Petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner stated that the detention order is liable to be quashed on the ground that in the grounds of detention, one of the altered offences is mentioned as Section 395 of I.P.C, whereas, in the remand report, it is mentioned as Section 392 of I.P.C. Hence, it is submitted that the detainee was deprived of making effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that the one altered offence mentioned by the Sponsoring Authority is in contradiction with the remand report. This would deprive the detainee of making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention.



H.C.P.No.816 of 2024

WEB COPY

5. In this context, it is useful to refer to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of '**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 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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.816 of 2024

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 order is liable to be quashed.

7. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 24.03.2024 in Cr.M.P.No.25/Goonda/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenue namely Jegadish alias Jegadiskumar, aged about 39 years, S/o.Mani, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.



H.C.P.No.816 of 2024

WEB COPY

[M.S.R., J]
22.07.2024

[S.M., J]

Index : yes/no
Speaking order/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation : yes/no
grs

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Magistrate & District Collector,
Tiruppur District,
Tiruppur.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Tiruppur,
Tiruppur District.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison - Coimbatore,
Coimbatore District.
5. The Inspector of Police,
KANGAYAM Police Station,
Tiruppur District.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.816 of 2024

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

grs

H.C.P.No.816 of 2024

22.07.2024