



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1398 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 09.08.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

H.C.P.No.1398 of 2024

K.Priya

... Petitioner/Wife of Detenue

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by its Secretary to Government [Home],
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
 2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai City,
Chennai District.
 3. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison Puzhal,
Chennai District.
 4. The Inspector of Police,
Immoral Traffic Prevention Unit-1,
Egmore,
Chennai - 600 008.
- ... Respondents



HCP.No.1398 of 2024

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records of the 2nd respondent, in his proceedings S.C.No.429/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 29.04.2024 and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to produce petitioner's husband (Kumar aged 42 years son of Subramani) before this Court now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal set him at liberty.

For Petitioner	: M/s.R.Vinothkumar
For Respondents	: Mr.E.Raj Thilak Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by *S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.*)

The preventive detention order passed by the second respondent is under challenge in the present Habeas Corpus Petition.

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



HCP.No.1398 of 2024

Authority is vitiated as the copy of the grounds of detention has not been properly translated in English. It is therefore stated that the detenu is deprived of his valuable right to make effective representation.

4. 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 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 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



HCP.No.1398 of 2024

free forthwith unless she is required to be detained in any other case. The appeal is accordingly allowed.”

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 29.04.2024 in proceedings No.429/BCDFGISSSV/2024 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is **allowed**. The detenu viz., Kumar, S/o.Subramani , aged about 42 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.

[S.M.S., J.]

[V.S.G., J.]

09.08.2024

veda

Index : Yes/No

Speaking Order : Yes/No

Neutral Citation : Yes/No



HCP.No.1398 of 2024

To

WEB COPY

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by its Secretary to Government [Home],
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai City,
Chennai District.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison Puzhal,
Chennai District.
4. The Inspector of Police,
Immoral Traffic Prevention Unit-1,
Egmore,
Chennai - 600 008.
5. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1398 of 2024

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
AND
V.SIVAGNANAM, J.

veda

H.C.P.No.1398 of 2024

09.08.2024