



HCP.No.2335 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 30.10.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

H.C.P.No.2335 of 2024

Usha

... Petitioner/Mother of the
detenu

Vs.

1. Government of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by its Principal Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Ranipet District Office,
Ranipet District.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
O/o. Ranipet Superintendent of Police,
Ranipet District.
4. The Inspector of Police,
Arakkonam Town Police Station,
Ranipet District.



HCP.No.2335 of 2024

5. The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Vellore.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the entire records culminating in the passing of the order of detention the petitioner's son of the defence under Act 1982 as GOONDAS vide detention order in No.B3/D.O.No.53/2024 dated 10.07.2024 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondent herein to produce the body and person of the detenu by name Manikandan @ Butta Mani S/o. Gopi, aged about 19 years before this Court and set him at liberty from the detention now confined at Central Prison, Vellore.

For Petitioner	: Mr.A.Vijayasankar
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 10.07.2024 is sought to be quashed in the present habeas corpus petition.



HCP.No.2335 of 2024

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

3. Page Nos.20 and 37 in Volume-II of the booklet served on the detainee is found to be illegible. In view of the fact that illegible documents were served, the detainee has been deprived of submitting effective representation, which is a mandate under the statute.

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 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:



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2335 of 2024

“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.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2335 of 2024

..... **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.”*

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. Hence, for the aforesaid reason, the detention order passed by the second respondent in proceedings B3/ D.O.No.53/2024 dated 10.07.2024 is quashed and the Habeas Corpus Petition is **allowed**. The detenue viz., Manikandan @ Butta Mani, aged 19 years, S/o. Gopi 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.]
30.10.2024

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



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2335 of 2024



HCP.No.2335 of 2024

To

WEB COPY

1. The Principal Secretary,
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 District Collector and District Magistrate,
Ranipet District Office,
Ranipet District.
4. The Superintendent of Police,
O/o. Ranipet Superintendent of Police,
Ranipet District.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Arakkonam Town Police Station,
Ranipet District.
6. The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Vellore.
7. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai - 104.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2335 of 2024

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

veda

H.C.P.No.2335 of 2024

30.10.2024