



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1668 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 19.08.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE R.SAKTHIVEL

H.C.P.No.1668 of 2024

Saravanan

... Petitioner/Father of the
detenue

Vs.

1. State of Tamil Nadu represented
By Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai – 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai.
4. State Rep. by Inspector of Police,
H6, RK Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondents



HCP.No.1668 of 2024

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records of the 2nd respondent pertaining to the order made in Memo No. 607/BCDFGISSSV/2024, dated 30.05.2024 in detaining the detenue under the Tamil Nadu Act 14/1982 as a brand of Goonda and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenue, Dinesh @ Deena, aged 23 years who is detained at the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.Ramachandran
For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner herein, who is the father of the detenu namely Dinesh @ Deena S/o. Saravanan aged about 23 years, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 30.05.2024 slapped on his son, branding him as "Goonda" under the 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.



HCP.No.1668 of 2024

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the Government Order in G.O.(D).No.82, Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department dated 15.04.2024 has not been translated in the language known to the detenue and thus the detenu is deprived from making effective representation. Further, it is submitted that the detenue was arrested on 30.04.2024 and the impugned order of detention was passed on 30.05.2024 i.e., after a lapse of one month.

4. On perusal of the documents available on record, particularly in Page Nos.415 to 417 of Volume I of the booklet, a copy of the Government Order in G.O.(D).No.82, Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department dated 15.04.2024 is available and the translated copy in vernacular version of the same has not been furnished to the detenue. Therefore, the detenue is deprived from making effective representation and that the Detention Order passed by the Detaining Authority is vitiated. Further, it is brought to the notice of this Court that the detenue has not filed any bail application. Therefore, the inference drawn by the Authorities for detaining the detenue under Act 14 of 1982 is not based on any acceptable ground.



HCP.No.1668 of 2024

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



HCP.No.1668 of 2024

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.

..... **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.



HCP.No.1668 of 2024

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 30.05.2024 in proceedings No.607/BCDFGISSSV/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is **allowed**. The detenu viz., Dinesh @ Deena S/o Saravanan, 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.

[S.M.S., J.] [R.S.V., J.]
19.08.2024

Index : Yes/No
Speaking Order : Yes/No
Neutral Citation : Yes/No

veda



HCP.No.1668 of 2024

To

1. State of Tamil Nadu represented
By Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai – 600 009.
2. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and Order) Department,
Fort St.Geore, Chennai - 9.
3. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.
4. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai.
5. State Rep. by Inspector of Police,
H6, RK Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai - 104.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1668 of 2024

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
AND
R.SAKTHIVEL, J.

veda

H.C.P.No.1668 of 2024

19.08.2024