



**H.C.P.(MD) No.279 of 2024**

**WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT**

**DATED : 31.07.2024**

**CORAM:**

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

**H.C.P.(MD) No.279 of 2024**

Gowtham

... Petitioner

-vs-

1.The Principal Secretary  
to Government  
State of Tamil Nadu  
Home, Prohibition and  
Excise Department  
Fort St.George  
Chennai-600 009

2.The Commissioner of Police  
Office of the Commissioner of Police  
Tirunelveli City  
Tirunelveli

3.The Superintendent of Prison  
Palayamkottai Central Prison  
Tirunelveli District

... Respondents



**H.C.P.(MD) No.279 of 2024**

WEB

**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 No. 7/BCDFGISSSV/2024, dated 30.01.2024, on the file of the second respondent and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the body of the petitioner, namely, Gowtham, son of Sudalaimani, aged about 27 years, now confined in Central Prison, Palayamkottai, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Alagumani

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 detenu viz., Gowtham, son of Sudalaimani, aged about 27 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order No.7/BCDFGISSSV/2024, dated 30.01.2024, 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.



**H.C.P.(MD) No.279 of 2024**

WEB COPY

**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 points have been raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner, it is stated that the detention order is liable to be quashed on the ground that the detenu was furnished with illegible copy of the property statement relied on by the Detaining Authority, more particularly at Page Nos.81 to 83 of the booklet. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

**4.** On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that Page Nos.81 to 83 of the Booklet, which is the property statement, furnished to the detenu, is illegible. This furnishing of illegible copy of the vital document would deprive the detenu of making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention.

**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



**H.C.P.(MD) No.279 of 2024**

WEB COPY

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 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:

*"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*



WEB COPY



**H.C.P.(MD) No.279 of 2024**

*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 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 detenu 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 the documents available at Page Nos. 81 to 83 are illegible. This furnishing of illegible copy 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 impugned detention order.



**H.C.P.(MD) No.279 of 2024**

WEB COPY

**7.** In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention No.7/BCDFGISSSV/2024, dated 30.01.2024, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Gowtham, son of Sudalaimani, aged about 27 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.]**

**31.07.2024**

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

krk

To:

1.The Principal Secretary  
to Government,  
State of Tamil Nadu,  
Home, Prohibition and  
Excise Department,  
Fort St.George,  
Chennai-600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,  
Office of the Commissioner of Police,  
Tirunelveli City,  
Tirunelveli.



**H.C.P.(MD) No.279 of 2024**

WEB COPY

- 3.The Superintendent of Prison  
Palayamkottai Central Prison  
Tirunelveli District
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,  
Madurai.



WEB COPY



**H.C.P.(MD) No.279 of 2024**

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

**H.C.P.(MD) No.279 of 2024**

**31.07.2024**