



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.981 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 24.07.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.981 of 2024

Jothi .. Petitioner/
Mother of the detenue

Versus

1. State rep. By:
The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 9.
 2. The Commissioner of Police,
Salem City.
 3. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Salem.
 4. The Inspector of Police,
Azhagapuram Police Station,
Salem.
- .. Respondents

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 records in C.M.P.No.22/Goonda/SALEM CITY/2024 dated 04.04.2024 on the file of the Commissioner of Police, Salem City, the second respondent herein and quash the same as illegal and direct the respondent to produce



H.C.P.No.981 of 2024

the detainee Thiru. Ulaganathan, S/o.Vengatesan, aged about 26 years, now confined at Central Prison, Salem, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Sengkodi

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the mother of the detainee namely Ulaganathan, aged about 26 years, S/o.Venkatesan, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 04.04.2024 slapped on her son, branding him as "Goonda" 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].

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



H.C.P.No.981 of 2024

WEB COPY

3. Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner pointed out that even though, in the detention order, the Detaining Authority has recorded that the remand period of the accused was extended till 04.04.2024, however, the remand extension order has not been furnished to the detainee. It is in this circumstances, the learned counsel for the petitioner stated that serious prejudice has been caused to the petitioner for making effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that the copy of the the remand extension order is not available in the booklet as the same has not been furnished to the detainee. Since a specific stand has been taken that serious prejudice is caused to the petitioner, this Court finds that the failure to furnish a copy of the remand extension order vitiates the Detention Order.

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 effectively against the Detention Order and that, the failure to supply every



H.C.P.No.981 of 2024

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.981 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 04.04.2024 in C.M.P.No.22/Goonda/Salem City/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Ulaganathan, aged about 26 years, S/o.Venkatesan, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R., J]
24.07.2024

[S.M., J]



H.C.P.No.981 of 2024

Index : yes/no

Speaking order/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation : yes/no

grs

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.

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 9.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Salem City.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Salem.
4. The Inspector of Police,
Azhaapuram Police Station,
Salem.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.981 of 2024

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

grs

H.C.P.No.981 of 2024

24.07.2024