



HCP.No.955 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 25.07.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.955 of 2024

Veeraraghavan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by The Chief Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Kancheepuram District,
Kancheepuram.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Kancheepuram District,
Kancheepuram.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Oragadam Police Station,
Kancheepuram District.

5.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison - II,
Puzhal, Chennai – 600 063.

... Respondents



HCP.No.955 of 2024

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 Rc.No.47/2024/M6-D.O.No.17/2024 dated 05.04.2024 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's son/detenu namely Yuvanesh Kumar, aged about 20 years, S/o.Veeraraghavan, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set the petitioner's son/detenu namely Yuvanesh Kumar, aged about 20 years, S/o.Veeraraghavan, at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Muthukumar

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 detenu namely Yuvanesh Kumar, Male, aged about 20 years, S/o.Veeraraghavan, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 05.04.2024 slapped on his son, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous



HCP.No.955 of 2024

WEB COPY

Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, 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 the learned counsel for the petitioner has raised several other grounds to assail the order of detention, he has mainly focused his argument on the ground that the Government Order in G.O.(D).No.21, Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department dated 10.01.2024, has not been translated in vernacular language. This deprived the detenu from making effective representation. Therefore, on this sole ground, the detention order is liable to be quashed.

4. On perusal of the documents available on record, it is clear that the Government Order in G.O.(D).No.21, Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department dated 10.01.2024, has not been translated in



HCPNo.955 of 2024

vernacular language. Therefore, the detenu is deprived from making effective representation and 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 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



WEB COPY



HCPNo.955 of 2024

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 order is liable to be quashed.



HCP.No.955 of 2024

WEB COPY

7. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 05.04.2024 in Rc.No.47/2024/M6-D.O.No.17/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Yuvanesh Kumar, Male, aged about 20 years, S/o.Veeraraghavan, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R., J]

[S.M., J]

25.07.2024

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Sni

Note:- Registry shall forthwith
return the booklet containing the
materials, on which, the
Detaining Authority has placed
reliance, to the
petitioner/counsel for the
petitioner with due
acknowledgment.



HCP.No.955 of 2024

WEB COPY To

- 1.The Chief Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Kancheepuram District,
Kancheepuram.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Kancheepuram District,
Kancheepuram.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
Oragadam Police Station,
Kancheepuram District.
- 5.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison - II,
Puzhal, Chennai – 600 063.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.955 of 2024

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

Sni

H.C.P.No.955 of 2024

25.07.2024