



H.C.P.(MD) No.161 of 2024

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 05.04.2024

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR**

H.C.P.(MD) No.161 of 2024

K.Bagyaraj

... Petitioner

-VS-

1.State of Tamil Nadu
rep.by the Principal Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat
Chennai-600 009

2.The District Magistrate and
District Collector
Virudhunagar District
Virudhunagar

3.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Jail
Madurai

... Respondents



WEB COPY

H.C.P.(MD) No.161 of 2024

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the entire records in detention order in Cr.M.P.No.30/2023, dated 28.10.2023, on the file of the second respondent and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the body of the petitioner's son, namely, Krishnaprabu, son of Pakkiyaraj, aged about 25 years, now confined in Central Prison, Madurai, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Thiruvavutselvan

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.]

The petitioner is the father of the detenu viz., Krishnaprabu, aged about 25 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Cr.M.P.No.30/2023, dated 28.10.2023, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this habeas corpus petition.



WEB COPY

H.C.P.(MD) No.161 of 2024

2. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents. We have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.

3. Though several grounds have been raised in the habeas corpus petition, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the impugned detention order is vitiated on the ground of non-furnishing of legible and translated copy of the remand order in the vernacular language. According to the petitioner, the remand order passed by the PCR Court, Srivilliputtur against the detenu herein and one Mahalingasundaramoorthy, who is the detenu in H.C.P.(MD) No.1575 of 2023, is illegible and it is in English language. Therefore, that the detenu herein is deprived of his valuable right to make an effective representation. Further, this Court by order dated 05.04.2024 in H.C.P.(MD) No.1575 of 2023, has set aside the detention order passed against the co-detenu, on the ground of non-furnishing of legible and translated copy of the remand order in the vernacular language to the detenu.



H.C.P.(MD) No.161 of 2024

WEB COPY

4. It is seen that the respondents have not filed counter affidavit in this habeas corpus petition. On a perusal of the Booklet filed in the connected H.C.P.(MD) No.1575 of 2023 filed by the co-detenu, this Court finds that the legible and translated copy of the remand order passed against the detenu herein and other detenu (in H.C.P.(MD) No.1575 of 2023) relied on by the Detaining Authority at Page No.69 of the booklet, in vernacular language, has not been furnished to the detenu. Therefore, we are of the view that the non-furnishing of legible and translated copy of the said document would deprive the detenu of his valuable right to make an effective representation. Further, this Court by order dated 05.04.2023 passed in the connected H.C.P. (MD) No.1575 of 2023, set aside the detention order passed against the co-detenu. It is in the said circumstances, this Court finds that the present impugned detention order passed by the Detaining Authority is also vitiated.

5. In this context, it is useful to refer to the Judgment of the Honourable Supreme Court in the case of **Powanammal vs. State of Tamil Nadu**, reported in **(1999) 2 SCC 413**, wherein the Apex Court, after discussing the safeguards embodied in Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India, observed that the detenu should be afforded an opportunity of making a representation effectively against the detention order and that, the failure to



H.C.P.(MD) No.161 of 2024

supply every material in the language which can be understood by the detenu, is imperative. The relevant portion of the said decision is extracted hereunder:

"6. The short question that falls for our consideration is whether failure to supply the Tamil version of the order of remand passed in English, a language not known to the detenu, would vitiate her further detention.

...

...

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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.161 of 2024

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 nonsupply 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."

6. We find that the above cited ***Powanammal***'s case applies in all force to the case on hand as we find that non-furnishing of legible and translated copy of the remand order relied on by the Detaining Authority at Page No.69 of the booklet of H.C.P.(MD) No.1575 of 2023, in vernacular language, to the detenu, has impaired his constitutional right to make an effective representation against the impugned preventive detention order. To be noted, this constitutional right is ingrained in the form of a safeguard in Clause (5) of Article 22 of the Constitution of India. We, therefore, have no hesitation in quashing the present impugned detention order also.



H.C.P.(MD) No.161 of 2024

WEB COPY

7. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Cr.M.P.No.30/2023, dated 28.10.2023, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Krishnaprabu, son of Pakkiyaraj, aged about 25 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[A.D.J.C., J.] [K.R.S., J.]

05.04.2024

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No

krk

To:

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and
District Collector,
Virudhunagar District,
Virudhunagar.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Jail,
Madurai.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.161 of 2024

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.
AND
K.RAJASEKAR, J.
krk

H.C.P.(MD) No.161 of 2024

05.04.2024