



HCP(MD)No.1606 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 02.04.2024

CORAM

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

H.C.P.(MD)No.1606 of 2023

Eswari

.. Petitioner / Wife of the Detenu

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by the Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 9.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tiruchirappalli City.

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.

.. Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the detention order passed by the second respondent in C.No.94/Detention/C.P.O/TC/2023 dated 16.10.2023 and to quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the person or body of the detenu,



HCP(MD)No.1606 of 2023

Padaiyappa @ Rengaraj, son of Marimuthu, aged about 43 years before this Court and set him at liberty, now detained at Central Prison, Trichy.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.K.M.Appaji
For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA,J.)

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Padaiyappa alias Rengaraj, aged about 43 years, S/o.Marimuthu. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C.No.94/Detention/C.P.O/TC/2023 dated 16.10.2023 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.



HCP(MD)No.1606 of 2023

WEB COPY

3. Though several grounds have been raised in the Habeas Corpus Petition, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would mainly focus his argument on the ground that the document relied upon by the Detaining Authority at Page 17 of Volume II of the booklet has not been supplied to the detenu in the language known to him. It is therefore stated that the detenu is deprived of his valuable right to make an effective representation.

4. Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, strongly opposed the Habeas Corpus Petition by filing his counter.

5. On perusal of the booklet, in particular, Page No.17 of Volume II, this Court finds that the document relied upon by the Detaining Authority has not been furnished to the detenu in vernacular language. Therefore, we are of the view that the non-furnishing of the translated copy of the document relied upon by the Detaining Authority in vernacular language would deprive the detenu of his valuable right to make an effective representation.



6. In this context, it is useful to refer to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Powanammal Vs. State of Tamil Nadu*** reported in **(1999) 2 SCC 413**, wherein, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, after discussing the safeguards embodied in Article 22(5) of the Constitution, observed that the detenu should be afforded an opportunity of making 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 order reads as follows:

“6. The short question that falls for our consideration is whether failure to supply Tamil version of the order of remand passed in English, a language not known to the detenue, would vitiate her further detention.

...

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



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1606 of 2023

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.

.....

16. For the above reasons, in our view, the non-supply 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.”

7. Thus, the detention order is vitiated on the ground of non-furnishing of the vital documents in the vernacular language and hence, the same is liable to be quashed.

8. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in C.No.94/Detention/C.P.O/TC/2023 dated 16.10.2023 passed



HCP(MD)No.1606 of 2023

by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Padaiyappa alias Rengaraj, S/o.Marimuthu, aged about 43 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.)
02.04.2024

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Lm

To

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
The State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 9.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tiruchirappalli City.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1606 of 2023

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA,J.
and
K.RAJASEKAR,J.

Lm

H.C.P.(MD)No.1606 of 2023

02.04.2024