



H.C.P.(MD) No.659 of 2024

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 17.10.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE **MR.JUSTICE C.V. KARTHIKEYAN**

AND

THE HONOURABLE **MS.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA**

H.C.P.(MD) No.659 of 2024

Maideen Bath

... Petitioner

-Vs-

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

2.The Commissioner of Police
Tiruchirapalli District
Tiruchirapalli

3. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison,
Tiruchirapalli

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records pertaining to the impugned detention order passed by the second respondent made in his proceedings in



H.C.P.(MD) No.659 of 2024

WEB COPY

C.No.24/Detention/C.P.O/T.C/2024 dated 21.03.2024 in detaining the detenue under Section 2(f) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 as a Goonda and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenue namely Sheik Dawood, S/o.Beer Mohamed, Male aged about 38 years who is detained in Central Prison, Tiruchirapalli, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner	: M/s.C.R. Ponnuthai
For Respondents	: Mr.S.Ravi
	Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

The petitioner is the mother of the detenue namely, Sheik Dawood, S/o.Beer Mohamed, aged about 38 years . The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C.No.24/Detention/C.P.O/T.C/2024 dated 21.03.2024, 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.659 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 the detenu with the legible copies of the remand extension order more specifically at page No.61. This deprived the detenu from making effective representation. Therefore, on this 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 of the booklet, it is clear that the detenu was furnished with the illegible copies of the remand extension order. 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



H.C.P.(MD) No.659 of 2024

WEB COPY

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



H.C.P.(MD) No.659 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 the legible copies of the remand extension order was not furnished to the detenue. This non furnishing of legible copies of remand extension 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 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.659 of 2024

WEB COPY

7. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in C.No.24/Detention/C.P.O/T.C/2024 dated 21.03.2024, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Sheik Dawood, S/o.Beer Mohamed, aged about 38 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[C.V.K., J.] & [R.P., J.]

17.10.2024

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

To:

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police
Tiruchirapalli District
Tiruchirapalli
3. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison,
Tiruchirapalli



H.C.P.(MD) No.659 of 2024

WEB COPY

4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.659 of 2024

C.V. KARTHIKEYAN, J.

AND

R.POORNIMA, J.

aav

H.C.P.(MD) No.659 of 2024

17.10.2024