



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1043 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 02.07.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.1043 of 2024

Kumari

... Petitioner/mother of the detainee

Vs.

1.The State of Tamilnadu,
Represented by Secretary to Government,
Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tambaram City,
Office of the Commissioner of Police (Goondas Section),
Sholinganallur,
Chennai-600 119.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central prison, Puzhal,
Chennai District.

4.The Inspector of Police,
T-9, Maraimalai Nagar Police Station,
Chengalpattu District.

... Respondents



HCP.No.1043 of 2024

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records relating to the detention order dated 28.02.2024 passed by the second respondent in his proceedings vide BCDFGISSSV No.28/2024 and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's son namely B.Deepak @ Pakku, son of Balaraman, aged about 22 years, who is presently under going detention in Central Prison, Puzhal, as Goonda before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Parthiban

For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan
Additional Public Prosecutor
assisted by Mr.C.Aravind

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the mother of the detenu namely B.Deepak @ Pakku, son of Balaraman, aged about 22 years, detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 28.02.2024 slapped on her son, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders,



HCP.No.1043 of 2024

WEB COPY

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.19, 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 the sole ground, the detention order is liable to be quashed.

4. On perusal of the documents available on record, particularly in Page Nos.167 and 169 of the booklet, a copy of the Government Order in G.O.(D).No.19, Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department, dated 10.01.2024 is available and the translated copy in vernacular version of



HCP.No.1043 of 2024

the same has not been furnished to the detenu. 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 '**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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1043 of 2024

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 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.”*



HCP.No.1043 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 28.02.2024 in BCDFGISSSV No.28/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., B.Deepak @ Pakku, son of Balaraman, aged about 22 years, detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, 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]

02.07.2024

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Anu



HCP.No.1043 of 2024

WEB COPY

To

1.TheSecretary to Government,
Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tambaram City,
Office of the Commissioner of Police (Goondas Section),
Sholinganallur,
Chennai-600 119.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central prison, Puzhal,
Chennai District.

4.The Inspector of Police,
T-9, Maraimalai Nagar Police Station,
Chengalpattu District.

5.The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai

6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1043 of 2024

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

Anu

H.C.P.No.1043 of 2024

02.07.2024