WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 30.07.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.1217 of 2024

Manokaran ... Petitioner/father of the detenue

Vs.

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

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

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Thiruchirappalli.

4.The Superintendent of Police,
Mayiladuthurai District.

5.The Inspector of Police,
Mayiladuthurai Police Station,
Mayiladuthurai. ... Respondents

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records pertaining to the order of detention passed by the second respondent in C.O.C.No.11/2024 dated 10.04.2024 against the petitioner Manokaran's son the detenue, Sriram, aged 26 years, son of Manokaran, now confined at Central Prison, Thiruchirappalli, and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenue before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Santhosh

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 Sriram, aged 26 years, son of Manokaran, confined at Central Prison, Thiruchirappalli, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 10.04.2024 slapped on his 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

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

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 Form-95 Court Endorsement 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 No.75 of the booklet in Volume-I, a copy of Form-95 Court Endorsement is available and the translated copy in vernacular version of the same has not been furnished to the detenue. Therefore, the detenue is deprived from making effective representation and that the Detention Order passed by the Detaining Authority is vitiated.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

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 non-supply of such a document would amount to denial of the right of being communicated the*

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

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

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

order is liable to be quashed.

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 10.04.2024 in C.O.C.No.11/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Sriram, aged 26 years, son of Manokaran, now confined at Central Prison, Thiruchirappalli, 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]

30.07.2024

Index: Yes/No
Internet:Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Anu

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.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

To

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

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

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Thiruchirappalli.

4.The Superintendent of Police,
Mayiladuthurai District.

5.The Inspector of Police,
Mayiladuthurai Police Station,
Mayiladuthurai.

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

7.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

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

Anu

H.C.P.No.1217 of 2024

30.07.2024

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis