



H.C.P(MD)No.861 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.861 of 2024

Sunilkumar @ Sunil

... Petitioner

Vs

1. The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Exercise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai 9.

2. The Commissioner of Police (AIMS),
Tiruchirappalli District,
Tiruchirappalli.

3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.

4. The Inspector of Police,
Fort Police Station,
Trichy City.

... 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 relating to the pertaining to the detention of the petitioner namely Sunilkumar @



H.C.P(MD)No.861 of 2024

Sunil, S/o.Ashok Kumar, aged 23 years, under Section 2(f) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order in C.No. 31/detention/CPO/TC/2024, dated 02.04.2024 passed by R2 and direct the respondents to produce the person or body of the detenu Sunilkumar @ Sunil @ Ashok Kumar,aged about 23 years.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Rahul

For Respondents : Mr.S.Ravi

Additional Public Prosecutor.

ORDER

The petitioner is the detenu viz., Sunilkumar @ Sunil, S/o.Ashok Kumar, aged 23 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Detention Order in C.No. 31/detention/CPO/TC/2024, dated 02.04.2024 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.861 of 2024

WEB COPY

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, who belongs to the State of Rajasthan, has not been furnished with a copy of the letter addressed to the Forensic Department by the Inspector of Police, 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 copy of the letter addressed to the Forensic Department by the Inspector of Police has not been furnished to the detenu in vernacular language. The 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



H.C.P(MD)No.861 of 2024

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



WEB COPY



H.C.P(MD)No.861 of 2024

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 as we find that the copy of the letter addressed to the Forensic Department to test the samples seized from the accused by the Inspector of Police has not been furnished to the detenu in vernacular language. The non-furnishing of copy of the letter addressed to the Forensic Department by the Inspector of Police in vernacular language (Hindi) 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.861 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 Detention Order in C.No. 31/detention/CPO/TC/2024, dated 02.04.2024, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Sunilkumar @ Sunil, S/o.Ashok Kumar, aged 23 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



H.C.P(MD)No.861 of 2024

To

1. The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Exercise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai 9.

2. The Commissioner of Police (AIMS),
Tiruchirappalli District,
Tiruchirappalli.

3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.

4. The Inspector of Police,
Fort Police Station,
Trichy City.

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



WEB COPY



H.C.P(MD)No.861 of 2024

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

PNM

ORDER MADE IN
H.C.P.(MD) No.861 of 2024

15.10.2024