



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2017 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED :02.09.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

H.C.P.No.2017 of 2024

Vasantha

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. State Of Tamilnadu Rep. By
The Secretary Home Prohibition And Excise Department,
Fort St George,
Chennai - 600 009.

2. The District Magistrate And District Collector,
Cuddalore District,
Cuddalore.

3. The Superintendent Of Police,
Cuddalore District,
Cuddalore.

4. The Superintendent Of Prison,
Central Prison, Cuddalore.

5. The Inspector Of Police,
Ramanatham Police Station,
Cuddalore District.

... Respondents



HCP.No.2017 of 2024

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the detention order in C3/D.O./48/2024 dated 28.05.2024 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamilnadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce detainee namely Raja son of Azhagappan, Hindu aged bout-47, Middle Street Vaithyanathapuram, Tittagudi Taluk, Cuddalore District, now confined in Central Prison, Cuddalore before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Karuppaiyamooppanar

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 2nd respondent in C3/D.O./48/2024 dated 28.05.2024 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 detainee. The detainee has no knowledge in reading English and non-translation of the Government Order



HCP.No.2017 of 2024

caused prejudice to the detainee 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 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 detainee 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 detainee, 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 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.”*

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.



HCP.No.2017 of 2024

WEB COPY

5. Hence, for the aforesaid reason, the detention order passed by the second respondent in C3/D.O./48/2024 dated 28.05.2024 is quashed and the Habeas Corpus Petition is **allowed**. The detainee viz., Raja son of Azhagappan, Hindu aged bout-47, Middle Street Vaithiyanathapuram, Tittagudi Taluk, Cuddalore District, now confined in Central Prison, Cuddalore, 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.]

02.09.2024

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

sha



HCP.No.2017 of 2024

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

sha

To

1. State Of Tamilnadu Rep. By
The Secretary Home Prohibition And Excise Department,
Fort St George,
Chennai - 600 009.

2. The District Magistrate And District Collector,
Cuddalore District,
Cuddalore.

3. The Superintendent Of Police,
Cuddalore District,
Cuddalore.

4. The Superintendent Of Prison,
Central Prison, Cuddalore.

5. The Inspector Of Police,
Ramanatham Police Station,
Cuddalore District.

6. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.

H.C.P.No.2017 of 2024

02.09.2024