



H.C.P.(MD) No.468 of 2024

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 10.09.2024

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.V. KARTHIKEYAN
AND
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE J.SATHYA NARAYANA PRASAD**

H.C.P.(MD) No.468 of 2024

Kamadi Scientist @ Maharaja

...Petitioner/detenu

Vs.

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

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

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Palayamkottai Central Prison,
Tirunelveli 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 order of the second respondent in No.15/BCDFGISSSV/



H.C.P.(MD) No.468 of 2024

2024, dated 13.03.2024 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu by name Kamadi Scientist @ Maharaja, son of Sankaran, aged about 28 years, now detained in Palayamkottai Central Prison, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Vinoth Bharathi

For Respondents : Mr.S.Ravi

Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

The petitioner is the detenu, viz., Kamadi Scientist @ Maharaja, son of Sankaran, aged about 28 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in No.15/BCDFGISSSV/2024, dated 13.03.2024 holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) of the 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.



4. On a perusal of the detention order, it is seen that the remand order had not been properly translated in Tamil version, though it was mentioned in English version. This would deprive the detenu of making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention.



H.C.P.(MD) No.468 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 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



H.C.P.(MD) No.468 of 2024

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 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. This non-furnishing of correctly translated copy of remand order to the detenu, has impaired his Constitutional right to make an effective representation against the impugned preventive detention order. To be noted, this constitutional



H.C.P.(MD) No.468 of 2024

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.

7. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in No.15/BCDFGISSSV/2024, dated 13.03.2024 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Kamadi Scientist @ Maharaja, son of Sankaran, aged about 28 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.]

10.09.2024

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



H.C.P.(MD) No.468 of 2024

To:

WEB COPY

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Tirunelveli City.
- 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.468 of 2024

C.V. KARTHIKEYAN, J.
AND
J.SATHYA NARAYANA PRASAD, J.

RM

H.C.P.(MD) No.468 of 2024

10.09.2024