



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1262 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 01.08.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.1262 of 2024

Govinthammal

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State rep. By:
The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.Gorge,
Chennai-9.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Salem City.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Salem.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Kannankurichi Police Station,
Salem.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records in C.M.P.No.35/Goonda/Salem City/2024 dated 24.04.2024 on the file of the



HCP.No.1262 of 2024

Commissioner of Police, Salem City, the second respondent herein and quash the same as illegal and direct the respondent to produce the detenue Thiru.Manikandan, S/o.Murugesan, aged about 33 years, now confined at Central Prison, Salem, before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : M/s.S.Sengkodi
For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein is the mother of the detenu viz., Manikandan, aged about 33 years, S/o.Murugesan confined at Central prison, Salem, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 24.04.2024 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].



HCP.No.1262 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 points have been raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner, it is stated that the detention order is liable to be quashed on the ground that the detenu was furnished with illegible copy of the similar order relied upon by the Detaining Authority. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that the similar order relied upon by the Detaining Authority, which is available in Page No.90 in Volume-II of the booklet, is illegible. This furnishing of illegible copy of the vital document would deprive the detenu of making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention.

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



HCP.No.1262 of 2024

WEB COPY

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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1262 of 2024

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 order is liable to be quashed.

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 24.04.2024 in C.M.P.No.35/Goonda/Salem City/2024 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed.



HCP.No.1262 of 2024

The detenu viz., Manikandan, aged about 33 years, S/o.Murugesan confined at Central prison, Salem, 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]

01.08.2024

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Tsg

To

1.State rep. By:
The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.Gorge,
Chennai-9.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Salem City.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Salem.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Kannankurichi Police Station,
Salem.



HCP.No.1262 of 2024

5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

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

Tsg

H.C.P.No.1262 of 2024

01.08.2024