



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 29.06.2020

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl.O.P.No.9583 of 2020

R.Senthil Kumar M/40 yrs,
S/o.Late Radhakrishnan,
No.212, Nallankadi Street,
Thittakudi, Cuddalore.

...Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Superintendent of Police,
O/o. Superintendent of Police,
Cuddalore District.

2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
O/o.Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Thittakudi District.

3.The Inspector of Police,
Thittakudi Police Station,
Cuddalore District.

...Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying to direct the respondents to remove the petitioner's name from the History sheet maintained by the 3rd respondent in pursuant of the petitioner's representation dated 22.06.2020.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Muthamizh Selvakumar

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

ORDER

This petition has been filed seeking direction to the respondents to delete the petitioner's name in the History sheet maintained in the third respondent Police Station in pursuant of the petitioner's representation dated 22.06.2020.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an Advocate. The defacto complainant is none other than the family member of the petitioner. There was a property dispute pending between the



petitioner and the defacto complainant. Hence, in order to wreck vengeance, plenty of criminal cases have been foisted as against the petitioner. In continuation of the same and 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 on 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 this petition.

3. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents submitted that cases in Crime Nos.175 of 2013, 219 of 2020 and 300 of 2020 are pending against the petitioner. Hence, History Sheeted Rowdy Book was opened at the third respondent police station as against the petitioner and it is being expanded regularly as per the Police Standing Order. Therefore, he prays to dismiss this petition.

4. Heard Mr.P.Muthamizh Selvakumar, 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 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 Histroy 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



WEB COPY

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 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 :-

(i) The petitioner is directed to submit a fresh representation before the third 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 third respondent is directed to consider the representation based on the directions issued by this Court and pass orders on merits within the period of four weeks from the date of the receipt of the representation.

7. With the above directions, the this petition stands disposed of.

s/d-
Assistant Registrar(CS-III)

True Copy

Sub-Assistant Registrar

mpa
To

1.The Superintendent of Police,
O/o. Superintendent of Police,
Cuddalore District.

2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
O/o. Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Thittakudi District.



3.The Inspector of Police,
Thittakudi Police Station,
Cuddalore District.

4.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

Cr1.O.P.No.9583 of 2020

VGII (CO)
SP(14/07/2020)