



H.C.P.(MD) No.581 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.581 of 2024

Rajkumar

...Petitioner/detenu

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 of Prison,
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



H.C.P.(MD) No.581 of 2024

the detention order passed by the second respondent in Detention Order No.13/2024, dated 07.03.2024 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Rajkumar, son of Bharathiraja, aged about 36 years, now detained as “Drug Offender” at Madurai Central Prison, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Alagumani

For Respondents : Mr.S.Ravi

Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

The petitioner is the detenu, viz., Rajkumar, son of Bharathiraja, aged about 36 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Detention Order No.13/2024, dated 07.03.2024 holding him to be a "Drug Offender", as contemplated under Section 2(e) 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



H.C.P.(MD) No.581 of 2024

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 contents of the remand order had not been properly translated in Tamil version. In the English version of the remand order dated 08.02.2024, given in Page No.33, the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Dindigul, dated 08.02.2024 had stated that the word “family intimated.” which was not translated in Tamil version given in Page No.36. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

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.581 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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.581 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 properly 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 right is ingrained in the



H.C.P.(MD) No.581 of 2024

WEB COPY

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.13/2024, dated 07.03.2024 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Rajkumar, son of Bharathiraja, aged about 36 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.581 of 2024

To:

WEB COPY

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (xiv) 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 of Prison,
Madurai Central Prison,
Madurai District.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.581 of 2024

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

RM

H.C.P.(MD) No.581 of 2024

10.09.2024