



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1081 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.1081 of 2024

Karthik

... Petitioner/brother of the detenue

Vs.

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

2.The Commissioner of Police/Detaining Authority,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Coimbatore City,
Coimbatore.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Coimbatore,
Coimbatore District.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Thudiyalur Police Station,
Coimbatore.

... Respondents

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



HCP.No.1081 of 2024

detention order vide Memo C.No.18/G/IS/2024 dated 29.02.2024, passed by the second respondent and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's brother namely M.Jeevanantham, son of Maruthachalam, aged 22 years, confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Arun Kumar

For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the brother of the detenu namely M.Jeevanantham, son of Maruthachalam, aged 22 years, confined at central prison, Coimbatore, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 29.02.2024 slapped on his brother, 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].



HCP.No.1081 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 grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the order of Detention passed by the Detaining Authority is vitiated for material irregularities, as the copy of the Judicial Form No.14, has not been properly translated. It is therefore stated that the detenu is deprived of his valuable right to make effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, particularly in page No.25 of Volume I, a copy of the Judicial form No.14 is available, in which the offences charged against the detenue are mentioned as 392 r/w 397 and 506(ii) IPC, whereas, the offence under Section 307 IPC has been included in the translated copy available in Page 25 of the booklet. Therefore, this Court is of the view that the improper translation of the copy of the vital document relied upon by the Detaining Authority to arrive at a subjective satisfaction, would deprive the detenu of his valuable right to make



HCP.No.1081 of 2024

effective representation. It is in the said circumstances, this Court finds 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 continued detention, the detenu need not show that any prejudice is caused to him. This is because the



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1081 of 2024

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



HCP.No.1081 of 2024

order is liable to be quashed.

WEB COPY

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 29.02.2024 in Memo C.No.18/G/IS/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., M.Jeevanantham, son of Maruthachalam, aged 22 years, confined at central prison, Coimbatore, 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.1081 of 2024

WEB COPY To

- 1.The Secretary, Home,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police/Detaining Authority,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Coimbatore City,
Coimbatore.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Coimbatore,
Coimbatore District.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
Thudiyalur Police Station,
Coimbatore.
- 5.The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1081 of 2024

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

Anu

H.C.P.No.1081 of 2024

02.07.2024