



H.C.P.No.1633 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 24.07.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.1633 of 2024

Amudha

**.. Petitioner/
Mother of the detenue**

Versus

1. State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai - 600 009.
 2. The Commissioner of Police,
The Greater Chennai City,
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.
 3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai - 600 066.
 4. The Inspector of Police,
G-2, Periyamedu Police Station,
Chennai.
- .. Respondents**

Prayer : Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the detention order in Memo No.10/BCDFGISSSV/2024, dated 04.01.2024 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's son Govindaraj @ Manoj @ Kumki Manoj, S/o.Saravanan, aged



H.C.P.No.1633 of 2024

about 23 years the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Johnson Samuel

For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the mother of the detenu namely Govindaraj @ Manoj @ Kumki Manoj, S/o.Saravanan, aged 23 years, detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 04.01.2024 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].

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.



H.C.P.No.1633 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 the detenu was furnished with improper translated copy of the Accident Registers. This deprived the detenu from making effective representation. Therefore, on the sole ground, the detention order is liable to be quashed.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that the Accident Registers have been improperly translated. This furnishing of improper translated 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 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



H.C.P.No.1633 of 2024

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.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1633 of 2024

..... **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 04.01.2024 in No.10/BCDFGISSSV/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Govindaraj @ Manoj @ Kumki Manoj, S/o.Saravanan, aged 23 years, now detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R., J]
24.07.2024

[S.M., J]



H.C.P.No.1633 of 2024

Index : yes/no

Speaking order/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation : yes/no

grs

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.

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
The Greater Chennai City,
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai - 600 066.
4. The Inspector of Police,
G-2, Periyamedu Police Station,
Chennai.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1633 of 2024

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

grs

H.C.P.No.1633 of 2024

24.07.2024