



H.C.P.(MD) No.441 of 2024

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 20.09.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.V. KARTHIKEYAN

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE J.SATHYA NARAYANA PRASAD

H.C.P.(MD) No.441 of 2024

Parameshwari

... Petitioner

-Vs-

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

2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector
Dindigul District, Dindigul

3.The Superintendent,
Madurai Central Prison,
Madurai District

... 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 connected with the detention



H.C.P.(MD) No.441 of 2024

WEB COPY

order of the second respondent in Detention order No. 16 of 2024 dated 14.03.2024 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detainee by name Karthi @ Ponnuchamy, Son of Maruthapillai, aged about 33 years now detained as GOONDA at Madurai Central Prison before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty forthwith

For Petitioner : M/s.Arun Nithy

For Respondents : Mr.S.Ravi
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

The petitioner is the wife of the detainee namely, Karthi @ Ponnuchamy, Son of Maruthapillai, aged about 33 years. The detainee has been detained by the second respondent by his order in detention order No.16 of 2024 dated 14.03.2024, 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.

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.



H.C.P.(MD) No.441 of 2024

WEB COPY

3. Though the learned counsel for the petitioner has raised several other grounds to assail the order of detention, he has mainly focused his argument on the ground that the detaining authority, while detaining the detenu, has not furnished with the translated copies of the accident register relied on by him. This deprived the detenu from making effective representation. Therefore, on these ground, the detention order is liable to be quashed.

4. On consideration of the submissions made on either side and upon perusal of the documents available on record especially Page No.16 of the booklet, it is clear that the translated copy of accident register has not been furnished to the detenu. Thus the impugned detention order is liable to be set aside on this ground.

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



H.C.P.(MD) No.441 of 2024

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 the document in the language known to and understood by the detenu, should the document be in a different language.



H.C.P.(MD) No.441 of 2024

WEB COPY

...

...

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 the non furnishing of the accident register made by the authority concerned, in the vernacular language and furnishing of illegible copy of the document relied on by the Detaining Authority at Page No.16 of the Booklet. This non furnishing of remand extension order to the detenu and non furnishing of accident register in vernacular language 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.441 of 2024

WEB COPY

7. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in detention order No.16 of 2024 dated 14.03.2024, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Karthi @ Ponnuchamy, Son of Maruthapillai, aged about 33 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[C.V.K., J.] & [J.S.N.P., J.]

20.09.2024

NCC : Yes / No

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes / No

aav

To:

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector
Dindigul District, Dindigul



H.C.P.(MD) No.441 of 2024

WEB C

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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.441 of 2024

C.V. KARTHIKEYAN, J.

AND

J.SATHYA NARAYANA PRASAD, J.

aav

H.C.P.(MD) No.441 of 2024

20.09.2024