



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2161 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 19.09.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

AND

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE N.MALA

H.C.P.No.2161 of 2024

Suganthi

... Petitioner/Wife of the
detenue

Vs.

1. State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by the Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai Police Commissioner,
The Commissioner Office,
Vepery, Chennai - 7.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai - 66.
4. The Inspector of Police,
C1-Flower Bazaar Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondents



HCP.No.2161 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 Memo No.795/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 30.07.2024 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's husband Gowtham @ Chinna Gandu s/o Seenivasan the detenu now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set the petitioner's husband Gowtham @ Chinna Gandu S/o. Seenivasan, aged about 24 years the detenu herein at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Naresh
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 30.07.2024 is sought to be quashed in the present habeas corpus petition.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.



HCP.No.2161 of 2024

3. The Accident Register enclosed at page no.17 in Volume-I of the booklet served on the detenu has not been translated in the language known to the detenu. Thus, the detenu has been deprived of submitting his representation in an effective manner.

4. 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 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*



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2161 of 2024

is required to be detained in any other case. The appeal is accordingly allowed.”

5. 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.

6. For the aforesaid reasons,, the detention order passed by the second respondent in proceedings No.795/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 30.07.2024 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is **allowed**. The detenu viz., Gowtham @ Chinna Gandu S/o. Seenivasan, aged 24 years, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

[S.M.S., J.] [N.M., J.]
19.09.2024

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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2161 of 2024



HCP.No.2161 of 2024

To

1. State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by the Additional Chief 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.George, Chennai - 9.
3. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai Police Commissioner,
The Commissioner Office,
Vepery, Chennai - 7.
4. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai - 66.
5. The Inspector of Police,
C1-Flower Bazaar Police Station,
Chennai.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai - 104.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2161 of 2024

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
AND
N.MALA., J.

veda

H.C.P.No.2161 of 2024

19.09.2024