



H.C.P.(MD) No.979 of 2023

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 24.04.2024

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR**

H.C.P.(MD) No.979 of 2023

Siva

... Petitioner

-vs-

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government
State of Tamil Nadu
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat
Chennai-600 009

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate
Tenkasi District
Tenkasi

3.The Superintendent of Prison
Palayamkottai Central Prison
Palayamkottai
Tirunelveli District

... Respondents



WEB COPY

H.C.P.(MD) No.979 of 2023

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the entire records in detention order in M.H.S.Confdl.No.51/2023, dated 27.06.2023, on the file of the second respondent and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the body of the detenu, namely, Siva, son of Sathiyavasagam, aged about 22 years, now confined in Central Prison, Palayamkottai, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Prakash

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.]

The petitioner is the detenu viz., Siva, son of Sathiyavasagam, aged about 22 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in M.H.S.Confdl.No.51/2023, dated 27.06.2023, 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.



WEB COPY

H.C.P.(MD) No.979 of 2023

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 was furnished with illegible copy of the remand order available at Page Nos.159 and 161 of the booklet and the translated copy of the same in the vernacular language has also not been furnished to the detenu. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that Page Nos.159 & 161 of the Booklet, which is the remand order, furnished to the detenu, is illegible and it is also found that the translated copy of the same in the vernacular language has also not been furnished to the detenu. This furnishing of illegible copy and non-furnishing of the translated copy of the remand order in vernacular language would deprive the detenu of making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention.



WEB COPY

H.C.P.(MD) No.979 of 2023

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 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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.979 of 2023

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 detenu 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 non-furnishing of legible and translated copy of the remand order relied on by the Detaining Authority at Page Nos.159 and 161 of the Booklet in the vernacular language, 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.



WEB COPY

H.C.P.(MD) No.979 of 2023

7. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in M.H.S.Confdl.No.51/2023, dated 27.06.2023, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Siva, son of Sathiyavasagam, aged about 22 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[A.D.J.C., J.] [K.R.S., J.]

24.04.2024

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

krk

To:

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tenkasi District, Tenkasi.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Palayamkottai Central Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli District.



H.C.P.(MD) No.979 of 2023

WEB COPY

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



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.979 of 2023

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.
AND
K.RAJASEKAR, J.
krk

H.C.P.(MD) No.979 of 2023

24.04.2024