



H.C.P(MD)No.687 of 2024

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 15.10.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.V.KARTHIKEYAN

and

THE HON'BLE Ms.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA

H.C.P.(MD) No.687 of 2024

M.Tamilselvi

... Petitioner

Vs

1. The Principal Secretary to Government,
Govt of Tamil Nadu, Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Chennai - 9.

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of Collectorate,
Sivagangai District.

3. The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Madurai.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for records pertaining to the proceedings of the 2nd respondent made in his proceedings in Cr.M.P.No. 3/Ma.Sa.Ku/2024, dated 08.04.2024 and quash the same and set the petitioner's husband by name Aruvapandi@Muthupandi, S/o.Muthuraja aged about 40 years at liberty from 3rd respondent.



WEB COPY



H.C.P(MD)No.687 of 2024

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Prithviraj

For Respondents : Mr.S.Ravi

Additional Public Prosecutor.

ORDER

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Aruvapandi@Muthupandi, S/o.Muthuraja aged about 40 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Detention Order in Cr.M.P.No.3/Ma.Sa.Ku/2024, dated 08.04.2024 holding him to be a "Drug Offender", as contemplated under Section 2(e) 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.

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 has not been furnished with a



H.C.P(MD)No.687 of 2024

copy of the 'Remand Order' relied on by the Detaining Authority, in vernacular language. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that the Remand Order has not been furnished to the detenu in vernacular language. This non furnishing 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 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:



H.C.P(MD)No.687 of 2024

WEB COPY

"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.

...

...



WEB COPY



H.C.P(MD)No.687 of 2024

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 remand order has not been furnished to the detenu in vernacular language. The non-furnishing of remand order in vernacular language 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.

7. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Detention Order in Cr.M.P.No. 3/Ma.Sa.Ku/2024, dated 08.04.2024, passed by the second respondent is



H.C.P(MD)No.687 of 2024

WEB COPY

set aside. The detenu, viz., Aruvapandi@Muthupandi, S/o.Muthuraja aged about 40 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.)
15.10.2024

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

PNM

To

1. The Principal Secretary to Government,
Govt of Tamil Nadu, Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Chennai - 9.

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of Collectorate,
Sivagangai District.

3. The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Madurai.

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



WEB COPY



H.C.P(MD)No.687 of 2024

C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J.
and
R.POORNIMA, J.

PNM

ORDER MADE IN
H.C.P.(MD) No.687 of 2024

15.10.2024