

## **A. Alangarasamy vs State Of Tamil Nadu And Anr. on 13 April, 1987**

**Equivalent citations: AIR 1987 SC 1725, 1987 CRILJ 1887, 1987(2) CRIMES 210(SC), 1987(14) ECC 16, 1987(29) ELT 488(SC), 1987(1) SCALE 769, (1987) 3 SCC 159, 1987(2) UJ 115(SC), AIR 1987 SUPREME COURT 1725, 1987 (3) SCC 159, 1987 (3) IJR (SC) 215, 1987 CURCRIJ 280, 1987 SCC(CRI) 427, 1987 (2) UJ (SC) 115, 1987 CRIAPPR(SC) 208, 1987 CALCRILR 140, (1987) 29 ELT 488, (1987) 14 ECC 16, (1987) 1 SUPREME 376, (1987) 2 CRIMES 210, (1987) 2 CURLJ(CCR) 301**

**Author: V. Khalid**

**Bench: V. Khalid, G.L. Oza**

### **JUDGMENT**

V. Khalid, J.

1. Special leave granted. The petitioner in the Writ Petition and the appellant in the appeal are the same. Hence they are being disposed of by this common Judgment

2. The appeal is against the order dated 8-8-1986, passed by the High Court of Madras dismissing the writ petition filed by the petitioner challenging the order of detention passed against him under Section 3(l)(i) of the Conservation of Foreign Exchange and Prevention of Smuggling Activities Act, 1974. The writ petition under Article 32 seeks to challenge the order of detention separately.

2. The learned Counsel for the petitioner raised two questions before us. (1) There is variation between Tamil and English version of the grounds of detention served on the petitioner. According to him the order of detention in English states that the detention order has been passed to prevent the detenu from indulging in smuggling activities, while the grounds furnished to him in Tamil discloses that the detention order has been passed with a view to prevent him from transporting contraband goods. The English version would bring the ground under Section 30(1)(i) of the Act while the Tamil version would bring it under Section 3(l)(iii). The detenu knows only Tamil. The difference in this version caused prejudice to him in making a proper representation (2) The detaining authority did not despatch all the materials before it to the Advisory Board for the Advisory Board to come to an independent conclusion on the grounds of detention and the need for the detention.

3. The learned Judges who know Tamil well have considered the submissions made on the difference in the two versions. Reference was made to 'Law Lexicon' issued by the Government of Tamil Nadu. After considering the meaning of the words used in the English version and Tamil version, the High Court held that the submissions based on this ground were insufficient to quash the order of detention. Since no other contention was advanced before the High Court, the writ petition was dismissed.

4. We have considered the matter ourselves. We are also not impressed with this submission. The alleged difference between the two versions is not consequential. The order of detention and grounds accompanied clearly spelt out why the detenu was being detained. We are not persuaded to hold that the two versions are so different as to cause any prejudice to the detenu. We, therefore, agree with the High Court and dismiss the appeal.

5. The only other point argued before us by the learned Counsel for the petitioner is that all the materials available with the detaining authorities were not despatched to the Advisory Board for to the Central Government. After perusing the counter affidavit filed by the respondent we find that necessary materials had been despatched. The petitioner cannot succeed on the plea that non-dispatch of material had made the order of detention bad. In fact, the petitioner has not clearly averred as to what are the materials which he has in mind when he pleaded this case. We are not satisfied that the petitioner has made out a case for any relief in the writ petition either. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

6. In the result, both the appeal and writ petition are dismissed.