



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1673 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 02.08.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.1673 of 2024

Sudalai Vadivu

... Petitioner

Vs.

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Anna Nagar PEW Police Station,
Greater Chennai.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, call for the records in connection with the order of Detention passed by the second respondent 16.11.2023 in No.588/BCDFGISSSV/2023 against the petitioner Son Esakkidurai @



HCP.No.1673 of 2024

Kattadurai, Male aged 23 years S/o.Esakkipandi, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenue before the Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner	: Mr.D.Balaji
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 Esakkidurai @ Kattadurai, aged about 23 years, S/o.Esakkipandi, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 16.11.2023 slapped on her son, branding him as "Drug Offender" 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.1673 of 2024

WEB COPY

2.Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and 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 sole ground that the detenu was not furnished with the translated copy of the information provided to the Inspector of Police by the Sub Inspector of Police and hence, the detenu had been deprived of his valuable rights of making an effective representation as against the impugned order of detention.

4.On perusal of the Booklet, particularly at Page No.9, it is seen that the copy of information provided to the Inspector of Police by the Sub Inspector of Police has been partly translated in English and that the same improper translated copy was supplied to the detenu. Since a specific stand has been taken that serious prejudice is caused to the detenu, this Court finds that the failure to furnish a proper translated copy of the information in vernacular language, vitiates the 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 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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1673 of 2024

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 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 reasons, this Court is of the view that the detention order is liable to be quashed.

7. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent in No.588/BCDFGISSSV/2023, dated 16.11.2023, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu



HCP.No.1673 of 2024

Esakkidurai @ Kattadurai, S/o.Esakkipandi, aged 23 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.

[M.S.R., J]

[S.M., J]

02.08.2024

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Tsg

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.



HCP.No.1673 of 2024

WEB COPY To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
Anna Nagar PEW Police Station,
Greater Chennai.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1673 of 2024

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

Tsg

H.C.P.No.1673 of 2024

02.08.2024