



HCP.No.3260 of 2024

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 14.03.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

H.C.P.No.3260 of 2024

B.Vaithegi

... Petitioner/ wife of the detenue

Vs.

1. The Additional Chief Secretary To Government
Home Prohibition And Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Fort St George,
Chennai 600 009

2.The Commissioner Of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Office Of The Commissioner Of Police,
Vepery, Chennai

3.The Superintendent Of Police
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai

4.The Inspector Of Police
C-3 Sevenwells Police Station,
Chennai

... Respondents



HCP.No.3260 of 2024

WEB COPY

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records pertaining to the order of detention passed by the second respondent in his proceedings in NO.927/BCDFGISSSV/2024 dated 06.08.2024 and quash the same illegal and produce the detenu, namely Balaji @ Lodukku Balaji @ Woodward Balaji, S/O. Sagayam, aged 37 years, Goonda, now he is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal II, Chennai, before this court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Raja

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public prosecutor
assisted by Mr.M.Sylvester John

ORDER

M.S.RAMESH, J.
AND
N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

The petitioner herein, who is the wife of the detenu namely Balaji @ Lodukku Balaji @ Woodward Balaji, S/O. Sagayam, aged 37 years, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal II, Chennai, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 06.08.2024 slapped on her husband, branding him as



HCP.No.3260 of 2024

WEB COPY

"Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Sexual Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

3. Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the order of Detention passed by the Detaining Authority is vitiated for material irregularities, as the copy of the remand order has not been properly translated in Tamil. It is therefore stated that the detenu is deprived of his valuable right to make effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet in Volume-I, particularly, in page Nos.71 and 73, this Court finds that the copies of the remand order are placed in both English and Tamil. However, some facts in the Tamil translated copy differ from the English version. Therefore, this Court is of



HCP.No.3260 of 2024

WEB COPY

the view that the improper translation of the copy of the vital document relied upon by the Detaining Authority to arrive at a subjective satisfaction, would deprive the detenu of his valuable right to make effective representation. It is in the said circumstances, this Court finds that the Detention Order passed by the Detaining Authority is vitiated.

5. In this context, it is useful to refer to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**Powanammal Vs. State of Tamil Nadu**' reported in '**(1999) 2 SCC 413**'. 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. In the said context, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held in Paragraphs 9 and 16 {as in SCC journal} as follows:

“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




WEB COPY



HCP.No.3260 of 2024

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.

..... **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.”*



HCP.No.3260 of 2024

WEB COPY

6. In view of the ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and in view of the aforesaid facts, this Court is of the view that the detention order is liable to be quashed.

7. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 06.08.2024 in NO.927/BCDFGISSSV/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Balaji @ Lodukku Balaji @ Woodwarf Balaji, S/O. Sagayam, aged 37 years, confined at Central Prison, Puzhal II, Chennai, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R., J]

[N.S., J]

14.03.2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Anu



HCP.No.3260 of 2024

WEB COPY

- To
1. The Additional Chief Secretary To Government
Home Prohibition And Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Fort St George,
Chennai 600 009
 2. The Commissioner Of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Office Of The Commissioner Of Police,
Vepery, Chennai
 3. The Superintendent Of Police
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai
 4. The Inspector Of Police
C-3 Sevenwells Police Station,
Chennai
 5. The Joint Secretary,
Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.
 6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.3260 of 2024

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

Anu

H.C.P.No.3260 of 2024

14.03.2025