



H.C.P.(MD) No.1448 of 2023

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 04.04.2024

CORAM:

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

H.C.P.(MD) No.1448 of 2023

Dhanabal

... Petitioner

-vs-

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

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate
District Collector and District Magistrate's Office
Thanjavur District

3.The Superintendent of Prison
Trichy Central Prison
Trichy 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 in detention order in P.D.No.50/2023, dated 05.08.2023, on the file of the second respondent and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the body of the



H.C.P.(MD) No.1448 of 2023

petitioner's son, namely, Babu @ Ananda Babu, aged about 30 years, now confined in Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Alagumani

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 father of the detenu viz., Babu @ Ananda Babu, aged about 30 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in P.D.No.50/2023, dated 05.08.2023, 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.

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.1448 of 2023

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 of non-furnishing of legible and translated copies of documents to the detenu by the Detaining Authority. According to the petitioner, certain documents in the booklet are not legible and not translated in the vernacular language. Though the petitioner made a representation to the respondents seeking legible copies of the documents available at Page Nos.17, 36, 41, 49, 148, 159, 190, 229 and 297 and the translated copies of the documents available at Page Nos.36, 37, 76, 80, 81, 82, 95, 199, 290 and 291 in the vernacular language, the same have not been furnished to the petitioner, due to which, according to the petitioner, he is deprived of making an effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that the documents mentioned in the petitioner's representation are illegible and not in the vernacular language. This non-furnishing of legible copies and translated copies of the documents in the 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.1448 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



WEB COPY

H.C.P.(MD) No.1448 of 2023

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 as we find that non-furnishing of legible copies and translated copies of the documents mentioned in the petitioner's representation 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.1448 of 2023

WEB COPY

7. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in P.D.No.50/2023, dated 05.08.2023, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Babu @ Ananda Babu, son of Dhanabal, aged about 30 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.]

04.04.2024

NCC : Yes / No

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes / No

krk

To:

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
District Collector and District Magistrate's Office,
Thanjavur District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Trichy Central Prison,
Trichy District.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.1448 of 2023

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

H.C.P.(MD) No.1448 of 2023

04.04.2024