



HCP.No.1998 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 05.09.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

H.C.P.No.1998 of 2024

Vellaiyammal

... Petitioner/Mother
of the Detenue

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep.by its Secretary to 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,
Virinchipuram Police Station,
Vellore District.

... Respondents



HCP.No.1998 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 of detention passed by the second respondent dated 22.07.2024 in C3.D.O.No.55/2024 against the petitioner's husband by name Thiru.Karthi, S/o. Selvaraj, aged about 21 years, now confined at Central Prison, Vellore, Vellore District and 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 preventive detention order passed by the second respondent dated 22.07.2024 is sought to be quashed in the present habeas corpus petition.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned



HCP.No.1998 of 2024

Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

WEB COPY

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 ground that the detenu was furnished with illegible copies in volume-II of the booklet. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that Page Nos.13 to 15 in Volume-II of the booklet furnished to the detenu, are illegible. This furnishing of illegible copies 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



HCP.No.1998 of 2024

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 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



HCP.No.1998 of 2024

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.

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent in proceedings C3/D.O.No.55/2024 dated 22.07.2024 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu



HCP.No.1998 of 2024

viz., Karthi, S/o.Selvaraj, aged 21 years 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.]
05.09.2024

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



HCP.No.1998 of 2024

To

WEB COPY

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep.by its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,
Fort St.George, Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and Order) Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 9.
3. The District Collector and District Magistrate of
Vellore District, Vellore.
4. The Superintendent of Police,
Vellore District, Vellore.
5. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Vellore,
Vellore District.
6. The Inspector of Police,
Virinchipuram Police Station,
Vellore District.
7. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai - 104.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.1998 of 2024

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

veda

H.C.P.No.1998 of 2024

05.09.2024