



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2644 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.2644 of 2024

Mukul Chandel

... Petitioner/Detenu

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by its Additional Chief Secretariat to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police/Detaining Authority,
Coimbatore City,
Coimbatore District.
3. The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Coimbatore - 18.
4. The Inspector of Police,
Coimbatore City Cyber Crime Police Station,
Coimbatore District
Crime No.158 of 2024

... Respondents



HCP.No.2644 of 2024

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to direct to produce the body of the petitioner detenue Mukul Chandel son of Neeraj Kumar Chandel aged about 24 years presently confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore, before this court and set him at liberty forthwith after calling for the records pertaining to the detention order dated 31.07.2024 in C.NO. 92/G/IS/2024 passed by the 2nd Respondent and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Prabakar
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 31.07.2024 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.

3. Most of the documents enclosed along with the booklet served on the detenu have not been translated and furnished to the detenu in the language known to him. The detenu is a native of Madhya Pradesh and the known language is Hindi.



HCP.No.2644 of 2024

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



HCP.No.2644 of 2024

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.”*

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.



HCP.No.2644 of 2024

6. For the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent in proceedings C.No.92/G/IS/2024 dated 31.07.2024 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is **allowed**. The detenu viz., Mukul Chandel, aged 24 years, S/o. Neeraj Kumar Chandel confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement 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
veda



HCP.No.2644 of 2024

To

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by its Additional Chief Secretariat to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, 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/Detaining Authority,
Coimbatore City,
Coimbatore District.
4. The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Coimbatore - 18.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Coimbatore City Cyber Crime Police Station,
Coimbatore District.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai - 104.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2644 of 2024

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

veda

H.C.P.No.2644 of 2024

30.10.2024