



WEB COPY

H.C.P.No.1912 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.1912 of 2024**

Tmt.Durga

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu,  
Represented by its Secretary to the Government,  
Home Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,  
Fort St. George, Secretariat,  
Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate of  
Vellore District, Vellore.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,  
Vellore District, Vellore.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison, Vellore,  
Vellore District.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,  
Prohibition Enforcement Wing,  
Vellore, Vellore District.

... Respondents

**Prayer:** Habeas Corpus Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution



H.C.P.No.1912 of 2024

of India for issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent dated 19.07.2024 in his office Ref.C3/D.O.No.48/2024 against the petitioner's husband by name Thiru.Ramaraj, S/o.Mottaiyan Aged about years, now confined at Central Prison, Vellore, Vellore District an set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the above said detenue before this Court and set him at Liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.E.Kannadasan

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 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent in C3/D.O.No.48/2024 dated 19.07.2024 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 detenu. The detenu has no knowledge in reading English and non translation



H.C.P.No.1912 of 2024

of the Government Order caused prejudice to the detenu 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 of India in the case of ***Powanammal vs. State of Tamil Nadu***<sup>1</sup>. 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.*

---

1 [(1999) 2 SCC 413]



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1912 of 2024

*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.*

..... **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.”*



H.C.P.No.1912 of 2024

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 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent in C3/D.O.No.29/2024 dated 05.04.2024 is quashed and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenue viz., Mr.Ramaraj S/o.Mottaiyan aged about 23 years, who is confined at Central Prison, Vellore 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.]**  
**27.08.2024**

Jeni  
Index : Yes  
Speaking order  
Neutral Citation : Yes



H.C.P.No.1912 of 2024

To

WEB COPY

- 1.The Secretary to the Government,  
The State of Tamil Nadu,  
Home Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,  
Fort St. George, Secretariat,  
Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate of  
Vellore District, Vellore.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,  
Vellore District, Vellore.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,  
Central Prison, Vellore,  
Vellore District.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,  
Prohibition Enforcement Wing,  
Vellore, Vellore District.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,  
Madras High Court.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1912 of 2024

**S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.**  
**and**  
**V.SIVAGNANAM, J.**

Jeni

**H.C.P.No.1912 of 2024**

**27.08.2024**