



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.947 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 10.07.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.947 of 2024

Inbaraj

.. Petitioner

Versus

1. State of Tamil Nadu
Represented by its Secretary,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai - 600 009.
 2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai Commissioner's Office,
Vepery, Chennai.
 3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison Puzhal,
Chennai.
 4. State rep by Inspector of Police,
P-6, Kodungaiyur Police Station,
Kodungaiyur, Chennai.
- .. Respondents**

Prayer : Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records of the detention order No.200/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated



H.C.P.No.947 of 2024

14.03.2024, on the file of the second respondent herein, and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the body of the detenue Ajay Edward @ Ajay, S/o.Inbaraj, Male, aged 24 years and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.K.Yukanth

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein is the father of the detenu viz., Ajay Edward @ Ajay, S/o.Inbaraj, aged about 24 years, confined at Central prison, Puzhal Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 14.03.2024 slapped on his son, 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 Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].



H.C.P.No.947 of 2024

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 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 detainee was furnished with illegible copies in volume-I of the booklet. Hence, it is submitted that the detainee was deprived of making effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that Page No.16 in Volume-I of the booklet furnished to the detainee, is illegible. This furnishing of illegible copy of the vital document would deprive the detainee 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 detainee should be afforded an opportunity of making representation



H.C.P.No.947 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 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



H.C.P.No.947 of 2024

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. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 14.03.2024 in No.200/BCDFGISSSV/2024 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenue viz., Ajay Edward @ Ajay, aged about 24 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.



H.C.P.No.947 of 2024

WEB COPY

[M.S.R., J]
10.07.2024

[S.M., J]

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

To

1. The Secretary,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai Commissioner's Office,
Vepery, Chennai.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison Puzhal,
Chennai.
4. The Inspector of Police,
P-6, Kodungaiyur Police Station,
Kodungaiyur, Chennai.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.947 of 2024

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

grs

H.C.P.No.947 of 2024

10.07.2024