



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1353 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 16.08.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.1353 of 2024

Vinoth @ Kida Vinoth

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Chennai.

3.The Inspector of Police,
F-2, Egmore Police Station, Chennai.

4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

... Respondents

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 petitioners detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order dated 21.03.2024 on the file of the second respondent herein made in proceedings No.230/BCDFGISSSV/2024 and quash the same as illegal and consequently, direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner



HCP.No.1353 of 2024

namely Vinoth (a) Kida Vinoth, aged 22 years, son of Vinayagam, before this High Court and set him at Liberty, now petitioner detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai - 600 066.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.C.Chellappan

For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The order of detention passed by the 2nd respondent in proceedings No.230/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 21.03.2024 is sought to be quashed in the present Habeas Corpus Petition.

2.The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the translation copy of the Government Order has not been furnished to the detainee. The detainee has no knowledge in reading English and non translation of the Government Order caused prejudice to the detainee from submitting effective representation, which is a valuable right under the Act.

3. In this context, it is useful to refer to the judgment of the Hon'ble



HCP.No.1353 of 2024

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 detenue 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 detenue, 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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1353 of 2024

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.”*

4. 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.

5. Hence, for the aforesaid reason, the detention order passed by the second respondent in proceedings Memo No.230/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 21.03.2024 is quashed and the Habeas Corpus Petition is **allowed**.



HCP.No.1353 of 2024

The detenue viz., Vinoth (a) Kida Vinoth, aged 22 years, son of Vinayagam, who is 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.]

16.08.2024

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

gd



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1353 of 2024

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

gd

To

Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Chennai.

3.The Inspector of Police,
F-2, Egmore Police Station, Chennai.

4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

5.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.

H.C.P.No.1353 of 2024

16.08.2024