

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 22.02.2019

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

W.P.No.19929 of 2016
and
W.M.P. No.17185 of 2016

S. Muruganathan ... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Chennai City Police Commissioner,
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.
2. The Deputy Commissioner of Police,
St. Thomas Mount,
Chennai.
3. The Assistant Commissioner of Police,
Selaiyur Range,
Chennai.
4. The Assistant Commissioner of Police,
Meenambakkam Range
Chennai.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Adambakkam Police Station,
Chennai.
6. The Inspector of Police,
Selaiyur Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondents

Prayer :

Writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to remove the name of the petitioner viz., S. Muruganathan, Son of Saminathan aged 46 years, residing at No.9/5, Jeeva Street, Gandhi Road, West Tambaram, Chennai - 45 from the History sheet maintained by the Subordinate Officers of the 2nd respondent within the St. Thomas Mount Range as per listings under Police Standing orders by observing due procedure.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.G.Thiyagu

For Respondents: Mr.M.Mohamed Riyaz
Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

The prayer sought for in the present writ petition is to direct the respondents to delete the petitioner's name in the History sheet maintained in the second respondent Police Station.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner was doing lottery business prior to the year 2002 and after a ban imposed by the State Government, he was doing other business. Hence, for statistical purposes, cases have been foisted as against the petitioner. In continuation, in order to harass the petitioner and to restrict his movements, at the instigation of the superior officers in the Police Department, History Sheeted Rowdy Book was opened at the second respondent police station and the petitioner was compelled to attend the police station in the pretext of enquiry in a routine manner. In this regard, the petitioner had already made several representations to delete the History Sheet, but the respondents have not yet considered till date. Therefore, he sought for allowing the writ petition.

3. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents submitted that the petitioner is an habitual offender and doing some illegal business, etc. Hence, History Sheeted Rowdy Book was opened at the second respondent police station as against the petitioner and it is being exanded regularly as per the Police Standing Order. Therefore, he prays to dismiss the writ petition.

4. Heard Mr.P.G. Thiyagu, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr.M.Mohamed Riyaz, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

5. The issue involved in this writ petition has already been dealt with by the Madurai Bench of this Court and detailed order has been passed in W.P.(MD)No.19651 of 2017 on 26.09.2018. On the basis of the above said Order, the Director General Of Police, Chennai issued a circular in Rc.No. 133410/Crime 4(3)/2018 dated 05.10.2018, which reads as follows :-

The Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court in its order dated 26.09.2018, in a batch of cases, in the reference second cited, while

quashing the History Sheet maintained in certain Police Stations and which are challenged before the Hon'ble Court, has observed and directed as follows :-

"28..... there is a general pattern adopted trend by the Police to continue to retain the names of the persons in the history sheet showing them as rowdies without any justifiable reasons. The Police did not realise that the purpose of opening a history sheet is to keep surveillance and check on hardened and habitual criminals in order to maintain peace and tranquility in the society.

29.As mentioned above, it also becomes the duty of the Police to keep reviewing the history sheet regularly to ensure that the persons, who are no longer required to be retained in the list are removed from the list, since it involves the dignity and public image of a person

30.Whenever representations are made by the persons whose names are found in the history sheet, it is the duty of the respondent Police to consider the same It will be of no use for the respondent Police to keep the representation pending even without considering them and driving the concerned persons to file appropriate petition before this Court. This Court only hopes that the Police learns a lesson at least after the passing of this order, to be more sensitive and serious in maintaining history sheet.

31..... The Police seems to be adopting the practice of registering FIRs against the persons under Sections 109 and 110 of CrPC, just to open the history sheet and to justify the continuance of the name of the persons in the history sheet. automatic opening of history sheet can be done only if the person has been convicted more than twice under Section 109 of CrPC and more than once under Section 110 of CrPC. Therefore, mere registration of an FIR under Sections 109 and 110 of CrPC can

never justify the action of the Police in continuing to retain the name of the person in the history sheet.

32.....

33.This Court wants to make it clear that in all future cases, where the retention of the name of a person in history sheet becomes a subject matter of challenge before this Court, if this Court finds that the name of the person has been retained without any justification and is in contravention with PSO Nos.746 to 748 and the guidelines given by this Court, compensation will be granted to the victims and the same will be directed to be recovered from the monthly salary of the Inspector of Police in whose station the history sheet is being maintained....."

2. Provisions contained in PSO 746 to 748 and the above orders of the Hon'ble High Court shall be followed scrupulously while maintaining the history sheets by the SHOs.

3. All Sub-Divisional Officers shall periodically review all History sheet files and Rowdy sheet files maintained in the Police Station under their jurisdiction.

4. IGPs in Zones, COPs in citites and the SPs in District shall sensitize all the Police personnel working under their jurisdiction in this regard and also review the cases periodically."

6. In view of the above circular passed by the Director General of Police, Chennai, this Court is inclined to pass the following orders :-

(i) The petitioner is directed to submit a fresh representation before the second respondent within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this Order.

(ii) On receipt of such representation, the second respondent is directed to remove the name of the petitioner from the history sheet maintained by the second respondent Police Station.

7. With the above directions, the writ petition stands allowed. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS V)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

vsi2/ssr

To

1. The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Chennai City Police Commissioner,
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.
2. The Deputy Commissioner of Police,
St. Thomas Mount,
Chennai.
3. The Assistant Commissioner of Police,
Selaiyur Range,
Chennai.
4. The Assistant Commissioner of Police,
Meenambakkam Range
Chennai.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Adambakkam Police Station,
Chennai.
6. The Inspector of Police,
Selaiyur Police Station,
Chennai.
7. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

WEB COPY

W.P.No.19929 of 2016

LN(CO)
CS/04/04/2019