

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 02.03.2018

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAVICHANDRABAABU

Writ Petition No.4699 of 2018

N.Vijay
S/o.Narasimman

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Sub Inspector of Police
Pallapatty Police Station
Pallapatty, Salem Taluk,
Salem District.
2. The Regional Transport Officer
Salem (West)
Salem District.

.. Respondents

Writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of Writ of Mandamus, directing the 2nd respondent herein to return the petitioner's Driving Licence bearing DL.No.TN-29-20020000921 forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Ganesan
For Respondents : Mr.S.Soundararajan
Government Advocate

O R D E R

Mr.S.Soundararajan, learned Government Advocate takes notice for the respondents. By consent of the parties, the main writ petition is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage itself.

2. The petitioner seeks for a Mandamus, directing the second respondent to return the petitioner's driving license bearing DL.No.TN-29-20020000921 forthwith.

3. Heard both sides.

4. The petitioner is a driver in a Private Company. It is stated that the petitioner's driving licence was seized, in pursuant to an accident taken place on 01.01.2018 and followed by the registration of FIR in Crime No.2 of 2018 under Sections

279 & 304(A) IPC. Now the petitioner seeks for return of the driving licence by contending that the second respondent is not entitled to seize and retain the driving licence, simply because a criminal case is filed against the petitioner and the same is pending.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner invited the attention of this Court to the Division Bench decision of this Court 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 Tambaram, Chennai & 2 others), wherein, this Court has considered a similar issue and found that even the suspension of the license on the ground that a criminal case is pending, is erroneous. I myself followed the above decisions in similar cases, wherein licence was suspended. Hence, I do not think that the second respondent is justified in retaining the driving license of the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed and the second respondent is directed to return the driving license of the petitioner immediately on receipt of a copy of this order. However, it shall not preclude the respondents 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/-
Assistant Registrar(CS IX)

//True Copy//

सत्यमेव जयते
Sub Assistant Registrar

mk
To

1. The Sub Inspector of Police
Pallapatty Police Station
Pallapatty, Salem Taluk,
Salem District.
2. The Regional Transport Officer
Salem (West), Salem District.

W.P.No.4699 of 2018

CS/05/03/18