



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1510 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.08.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.1510 of 2024

Meena

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Veppery, Chennai – 600 054.

3.The Inspector of Police,
N4 Fishing Harbour Police Station,
Chennai District.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
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 in connection with the order in the nature of writ call for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the second respondent dated 25.05.2024 in



HCP.No.1510 of 2024

BCDFGISSSV No.581/2024 against the petitioner's son Akesh, S/o.Tatoo Akesh, S/o. Murali aged about 29 years, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenue before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Chandarasekar

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 BCDFGISSSV No.581/2024 dated 25.05.2024 is sought to be quashed in the present Habeas Corpus Petition.

2.The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the translated copy of the Government Order has not been furnished to the detenue. The detenue has no knowledge in reading English and non translation of the Government Order caused prejudice to the detenue 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 Supreme Court in '*Powanammal Vs. State of Tamil Nadu*' reported in



HCP.No.1510 of 2024

'(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 finds a reference in the order of detention or among the grounds thereof. In such a case, the detenu's complaint of non-



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1510 of 2024

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 BCDFGISSSV No.581/2024 dated 25.05.2024 is quashed and the Habeas Corpus Petition is **allowed**. The detenue viz., Akesh, S/o.Tatoo Akesh, S/o. Murali aged about 29 years, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, is directed to be set at



HCP.No.1510 of 2024

liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case.

WEB COPY

[S.M.S., J.]

[V.S.G., J.]

27.08.2024

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

gd



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1510 of 2024

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

gd

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Veppery, Chennai – 600 054.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
N4 Fishing Harbour Police Station,
Chennai District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.
- 5.The Joint Secretary to Government
Public (Law and Order),
Fort ST.George, Chennai – 9.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.

H.C.P.No.1510 of 2024

27.08.2024