



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED **22.11.2019**

CORAM:

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN**

W.P (MD)No.24797 of 2019

Subramani @ Mathurmani

..Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Superintendent of Police,
Pudukkottai District,
Pudukkottai.

2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Keeranoor,
Pudukkottai District.

3.The Inspector of Police
Mathur Police Station,
Pudukkottai District.

..Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents 1 and 2 herein to remove the petitioner name from History Sheet record in H.S.No.62 of 2010 on the file of the 3rd respondent police station as per the petitioner representation, dated 21.09.2019.


For Petitioner
For Respondents

: Mr.B.Jameel Arasu
: Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi
Government Advocate (Crl.side)

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 from the history sheet in H.S.No.62 of 2010.

2.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that there was one criminal case in Crime No.352 of 2009, which was foisted against the petitioner by the third respondent police at the instigation of persons opposed to him due to political rivalry. In the above said criminal case, the petitioner was



acquitted by the Court of law more fully after full fledged trial during the year 2017. During the pendency of the above said criminal case more fully immediately after the registration of the case in the year 2010 the third respondent police has opened History Sheet against the petitioner in H.S.No.62 of 2010. 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 third respondent police station and the petitioner was compelled to attend the police station in the pretext of enquiry in a routine manner. Therefore, he sought for allowing the writ petition.

3.The learned Government Advocate (criminal side) appearing for the respondents submitted that the petitioner is an habitual offender indulging in rowdy activities, extortion, katta panchayats, etc. Hence, History Sheeted Rowdy Book was opened at the third respondent police station as against the petitioner and it is being extended regularly as per the Police Standing Order. Therefore, he prays to dismiss the writ petition.

4.Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) 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.



WEB COPY

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....."



WEB COPY

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 cities 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 :-

the concerned Deputy Superintendent of Police is directed to consider the petitioner's representation, dated 21.09.2019 and pass orders, on merits and in accordance with law, within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this Order.

7. With the above directions, the writ petition stands disposed of. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (AS)

// True Copy //

/ /2020

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

To

1. The Superintendent of Police,
Pudukkottai District,
Pudukkottai.

2. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Keeranoor,
Pudukkottai District.

3. The Inspector of Police
Mathur Police Station,
Pudukkottai District.



4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

+1 CC to Mr.B. JAMEEL ARASU, Advocate (SR-101308[F] dated
26/11/2019)

W.P (MD) No.24797 of 2019
22.11.2019

VB(08.01.2020) 5P 6C