

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED:13.12.2017

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE RAVICHANDRABAABU

W.P.No.32389 of 2017

C.N.Hemanthkumar

... Petitioner

vs.

1. The Licensing Authority
The Regional Transport Office,
Chennai District - 600 053

2. The Inspector of Police,
Traffic Investigation Wing,
TIW-Poonammllee Police Station,
Chennai District.

... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents 1 and 2 to return the Driving License of the petitioner forthwith to the petitioner

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Y.George Williams

For Respondents : Mr.P.V.Selvakumar,
Additional Government Pleader

O R D E R

Mr.P.V.Selvakumar, learned Additional Government Pleader takes notice for the respondents and by consent of the parties, the main writ petition itself is taken up for final disposal.

2. The petitioner seeks for a mandamus directing the

respondents 1 and 2 to return the Driving License of the petitioner forthwith to the petitioner.

3. It is seen that the petitioner is a driver employed in the Transport Corporation and his driving license was seized in pursuant to the accident took place on 06.10.2017 followed by registration of a criminal case in Crime No.1149/2017. It is further stated that the license of the petitioner is not suspended so far and no proceedings in any form was issued to the petitioner till this date. Therefore, it is contended by the petitioner that the seizure of the license and retaining the same is erroneous merely because the criminal case was registered against the petitioner in respect of an accident. Learned counsel for the petitioner, in support of his contention relied on the decision reported in 2010 Writ L.R. 100 (P.Sethuram vs. The Licensing Authority, The Regional Transport Officer, The Regional Transport Office, Dindigul) and a single Judge decision made in W.P.No.16958/2013 dated 01.07.2013 reported in 2013 Writ L.R.843 (S.Duraivelu vs. The Regional Transport Officer, West Thambaram, Chennai & 2 others).

4. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents submitted that the license of the petitioner was seized since an accident had taken place on 06.10.2017 while the petitioner was driving the vehicle.

5. Heard both sides.

6. It is seen that the petitioner's driving license was seized pursuant to the accident that had taken place on 06.10.2017 followed by the registration of the criminal case. It is further seen that the license of the petitioner has not been suspended so far. Even in respect of the cases where the license were suspended, this Court in the above referred cases, has held that the authorities are not entitled to suspend the license merely because the criminal case is registered against the petitioner. Therefore, the petitioner is entitled to get back the license, however, with liberty to the respondents to proceed against the petitioner in accordance with law.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed and the respondents are directed to return the driving license of the petitioner immediately on receipt of a copy of this order. However, it shall not preclude the first respondent

from initiating any action, if any of the contingencies specified in Clauses (a) to (h) of Section 19(1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, arises later or if any of the Rules as prescribed by the Central Government in pursuance of Section 19(1)(f) of the Act, are violated. No costs.

Sd/-

Deputy Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

vsi

To

1. The Licensing Authority
The Regional Transport Office,
Chennai District - 600 053
2. The Inspector of Police,
Traffic Investigation Wing,
TIW-Poonammllee Police Station,
Chennai District.

+1cc to Mr.R.Y.George Williams, Advocate, S.R.No.89080

+1cc to the Government Pleader, S.R.No.89181

W.P.No.32389 of 2017

RRK(18/12/2017)

सत्यमेव जयते

WEB COPY