

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 18.10.2024

CORAM :

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

H.C.P.No.2456 of 2024

Santhi

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.

2.District Collector and District Magistrate,
Cuddalore District, Cuddalore.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Cuddalore District.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Cuddalore-4.

5.The Inspector of Police,
Neyveli Thermal Police Station,
Cuddalore district.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, call for the records in Connection with the order of Detention passed by the second respondent dated 27.06.2024 in C3/D.O.No.59/2024 against the petitioner Younger Sister Son Pallu Prasath @ Prasath, Male aged 21 years S/o.Sakthivel, who is confined at Central prison, Cuddalore and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenue before the Court and set him at Liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Raman

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 Commissioner of Police, Greater Chennai in proceedings C3/D.O.No.59/2024, dated 27.06.2024 is sought to be quashed in the present Habeas Corpus Petition.

2. The detention order and the Accident Registered served on the detenue have not been translated. Though the Accident register is not translated, learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that it would not cause any prejudice to the detenue for submitting effective representation. Admittedly, the known

language to the detainee in the present case is 'Tamil'.

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*'. 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

11999 2 SCC 413

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.

5. Hence, for the aforesaid reason, the detention order passed by the second

respondent in proceedings C3/D.O.No.59/2024 dated 27.06.2024 is quashed and the Habeas Corpus Petition is **allowed**. The detenue viz., Pallu Prasath @ Prasath, Male aged 21 years S/o.Sakthivel who is confined at 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.]

18.10.2024

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

gd

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

gd

To

- 1.The Addl. Chief Secretary to Government,
- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.District Collector and District Magistrate,
Cuddalore District, Cuddalore.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Cuddalore District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Cuddalore - 4.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Neyveli Thermal Police Station,
Cuddalore District.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.

H.C.P.No.2456 of 2024

18.10.2024