



W.P.No.6682 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 23.06.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.SUNDAR
and

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE R.SAKTHIVEL

W.P.No.6682 of 2023

R.Saraswathy
W/o.Radha Krishnan

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State Rep. By its
The Home Secretary (Prison)
Home Department, Secretariat
Fort St.George, Chennai

2. The Director General of Prison
Thalaimuthu Natarajar Building
Egmore, Chennai – 600 008

3. The Superintendent of Prison
Salem Central Prison, Hasthampatti – 636 007

... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus to call for the records pertaining to the impugned order in No.1545/tha.ku.3/2022 dated 02.02.2023 passed by the 3rd respondent and quash the same and consequently direct the respondent to grant 30 days leave without escort to the convict prisoner D.Radha Krishnan, son of Duraisamy, Life Convict (CT.No.0631), aged about 49 years, now confined in Salem Central Prison.

Page Nos.1/19



W.P.No.6682 of 2023

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Mohamed Saifulla
For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by M.SUNDAR, J.,]

This order will now dispose of the captioned 'Habeas Corpus Petition' ['HCP' for the sake of brevity].

2. This order has to be read in conjunction with and in continuation of earlier proceedings made in the previous listings on 15.03.2023, 25.04.2023 and 14.06.2023, which read as follows:

Proceedings dated 03.03.2023

'Petitioner in the captioned Writ Petition is the spouse of a convict prisoner (Convict No.0631) now lodged in Central Prison, Salem. To be noted, the convict prisoner is a lifer as he is serving life sentence having been convicted in and by order and sentence dated 31.08.2015 made in S.C.No.206/2010 on the file of I Additional Sessions Court, Salem.

2. Be that as it may, a representation was made



W.P.No.6682 of 2023

seeking 30 days leave without escort to the convict on the ground that the petitioner (lifer's spouse) has medical ailments. This representation was negatived by third respondent in and by an order signed on 02.02.2023 bearing reference No.1545/jF3/2022 [hereinafter referred to as 'impugned order' for the sake of convenience and clarity]. To be noted, the impugned order has been signed on 02.02.2023 by third respondent but the date reads as02.2023. We find this to be a rather casual manner of dealing with liberty of a person which is sacrosanct qua sublime Constitutional philosophy.

3. Be that as it may, Mr.M.Mohamed Saifulla, learned counsel for petitioner, submits that the impugned order is a very terse order and no reasons much less tenable reasons have been given for negating the leave prayer.

4. Mr.R.Muniyapparaj, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, assisted by Mr.M.Sylvester John, who accepts notice on behalf of all the three respondents, sought two weeks time to file counter affidavit. As a preliminary submission, learned Prosecutor drew our attention to Rule 35 of the 'Tamil Nadu Suspension of Sentence Rules, 1982' [hereinafter referred to as 'said Rules' for the sake of convenience and clarity] and submits that a person qua whom a case is pending trial cannot be granted leave. However, prima facie, it appears that Rule 35 of said Rules is



W.P.No.6682 of 2023

also within the sweep of Rule 40 of said Rules which is power to exempt qua the Government i.e., executive arm.

5. We express no opinion at this prima facie stage. Let a counter be placed before this Court within a fortnight after favouring the petitioner's counsel with advance copy.

List a fortnight hence. List on 17.03.2023.'

Proceedings dated 27.03.2023

Learned counsel representing the counsel on record for petitioner requests for an adjournment stating that additional typed-set of papers needs to be filed. Request for adjournment acceded to.

2. List one week hence. List on 06.04.2023.

Proceedings dated 26.04.2023

Read this in conjunction with and in continuation of earlier proceedings in the previous listings.

2.Today, learned Additional Public Prosecutor served a copy of counter affidavit on the counsel for petitioner. Learned Prosecutor seeks time to file it in the Registry and bring it on board. Request acceded to.

3.List on 02.06.2023.

Proceedings dated 02.06.2023

Read this in conjunction with and in continuation of earlier proceedings made in the previous listing on 26.04.2023.

2. Today, Mr.M.Mohamed Saifulla, learned counsel for



petitioner is before us and learned counsel is ready but learned State Additional Public Prosecutor requests for an accommodation for circulating some case laws which according to learned Prosecutor has a bearing on the matter on hand. Request acceded to.

3. List a fortnight hence. List on 16.06.2023.

Proceedings dated 16.06.2023

Read this in conjunction with and in continuation of earlier proceedings made in the previous listing on 02.06.2023.

2.Today, Mr.M.Mohamed Saifulla, learned counsel on record for the petitioner and Mr.E.Raj Thilak, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor for respondents are before us.

3.Adverting to the aforementioned earlier proceedings, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor submits that the compilation is ready but he needs to circulate an order dated 15.06.2023 made by a coordinate Hon'ble Division Bench in Madurai yesterday vide W.P.(MD) No.13918 of 2023. Learned Public Prosecutor says that the order dated 15.06.2023 in W.P.(MD) No.13918 of 2023 may have an impact on the case on hand. Let the needful be done. Requests of Prosecutor acceded to.

4.List one week hence. List on 23.06.2023.'



W.P.No.6682 of 2023

3. The aforementioned proceedings shall be read as an integral part and parcel of the instant order. Therefore, short forms and abbreviations used in the aforementioned proceedings will continue to be used in the case on hand also.

4. Today, after hearing Mr.M.Mohamed Saifulla, learned counsel for petitioner and Mr.E.Raj Thilak, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondents, we are inclined to interfere with the impugned order, set aside the same and grant 20 days ordinary leave to the convict prisoner. The reasons are as follows:

i) In the impugned order, the only reason for negating the leave application of the convict prisoner is Rule 35 of 'the Tamil Nadu Suspension of Sentence Rules, 1982' [hereinafter 'said Rules' for the sake of convenience and clarity], which says that a person against whom the case is pending shall not be granted leave but this Rule 35 of said Rules is also within the sweep of Rule 40 of said Rules which vests with the Government the power to exempt from all or any of the provisions of said Rules. As we exercise constitutional powers,



W.P.No.6682 of 2023

there is no difficulty in exempting a convict prisoner from Rule
WEB COPY 35 of said Rules.

ii) In terms of precedents as regards the convict prisoner itself, the convict prisoner has already been granted leave one week, 12 days and for the period from 15.07.2020 to 24.07.2020 by three different Benches of this Court and the orders are as follows:

manupatra®

W.P.No. 6682/2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADRAS
407 No. 1257 of 2018
Dated: Oct. 18.09.2018

Applicant: R. Sureswathy
Vs.
Respondent: The Home Secretary (Prison), Home Department and Ors.

Hon'ble Judges/Concns:
C.J. Mahan and M. Aruna Kumar, JJ.

Counsel:
For Applicant/Respondent: Mr. M. Mohamed Salih
For Respondent/Respondent: N. Mohan Kumar, Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

C.J. Selvam, J.

1. The husband of the petitioner is a convict undergoing life imprisonment (Convict No. 631) at Central Prison, Salem, his being both convicted under the offence under Section 302 IPC, such conviction having been confirmed by this Court. He was later tried in two other Sessions cases.

2. We have heard counsel for petitioner, Mr. M. Mohamed Salih, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondents as also perused the counter filed by respondent.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner submitted that petitioner is suffering serious ailments and urgently requires the assistance of her husband.

4. On submission of learned Additional Public Prosecutor that the attendance of convict in Sessions cases against the life convict, provided for under the provisions of Section 302 IPC, we have called for a report from the learned Additional District Judge, Salem on the status of the case in S.C. No. 42 of 2018 as also shown in S.C. No. 42 of 2018 through the records. The report of learned Additional District Judge in S.C. No. 42 of 2018 dated 14.05.2018 informs that the case is pending on the file of Sessions Judge, Salem and the case in S.C. No. 42 of 2018 is pending on the file of Sessions Judge, Salem and the case in S.C. No. 42 of 2018 is pending on the file of Sessions Judge, Salem and the case in S.C. No. 42 of 2018 is pending on the file of Sessions Judge, Salem.

5. In the aforesaid circumstances, we are of the considered view that it would be appropriate to direct the Superintendent of Prison, Central Prison, Salem, the second respondent, herein, to release the husband of the petitioner, Mr. T. Radha Kishan (Convict No. 631), Son of Duraima, from 42 years on leave for a period of one week from 25.09.2018 to 03.10.2018.

6. Accordingly, we pass the following order:

(a) Respondents are directed to grant leave for one week to the convict T.

26

Sd/- JUDGE

Sd/- JUDGE

Sd/- JUDGE



WEB COPY



W.P.No.6682 of 2023



Radha Krishnan, convict prisoner No. 631, commencing from 26.09.2018 and concluding on 03.10.2018. The detenu shall surrender before the respondent on 03.10.2018 at 5.00 p.m.

[b] The Superintendent of Central Prison, Salem is hereby directed to pass appropriate orders for releasing the detenu, granting him one week leave.

[c] The Jail Authorities are directed to release the detenu, namely, T. Radha Krishnan, convict prisoner No. 631 on production of this order on 26.09.2018.

[d] It is made clear that the detenu should be brought back to the Central Prison, Salem, by 5.00. p.m. on 03.10.2018 without fail.

[e] The Jail Authorities during the period of LEAVE, shall provide proper escort to the detenu in order to ensure the safety and security of the detenu at the cost of the State. They shall also impose suitable conditions to that effect.

[f] The detenu should also abide by the conditions to be imposed by the authorities concerned.

7. With the above direction, this Habeas Corpus Petition shall stand closed. Post the Habeas Corpus Petition on 05.10.2018 for "Reporting Compliance".

© Manupatra Information Solutions Pvt. Ltd.



W.P.No.6682 of 2023

WEB COPY

(23)

12 days leave

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 09.04.2019

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.SATHYANARAYANAN
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.VIRMAI KUMAR

W.P.No.6 of 2019

S.Saraswathy

.. Petitioner

Versus

1. The Home Secretary,
Home Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai.
2. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison, Salem.

.. Respondents

Prayer:-

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus directing the respondents to grant of emergency leave for 30 days to the petitioner's husband T.Radha Krishnan, son of Duraisamy, prisoner No.7593 aged about 42 years, now confined in the Central Prison, Salem, before this Court and further directing the respondents to consider him immediately for the emergency leave and for consequential orders.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Mohamed Saifulla
For Respondents : Mr.C.Lyappa Raj
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by M.SATHYANARAYANAN, J.)

This Court in continuation and in conjunction with the earlier order dated 05.03.2019 is passing the following order. The petitioner is a Life Convict and the present Habeas Corpus Petition is filed by his wife alleging that she is suffering very much on account of Pelvic Inflammatory Disease. This Court has also called for a report from the Prison Officer and he has submitted his report dated 05.04.2019 addressed to



WP.No.6682 of 2023

WEB COPY

24


Superintendent of Police, Central Prisons, Salem, which would disclose that the wife of the detenu is suffering on account of the said illness and on an earlier occasion, the detenu came out on leave and returned back to the prison and nothing untoward was happened and the Probation Officer also recommended that he may be granted Emergency Leave with sufficient police escort.

2. In the light of the above facts and circumstances, this Habeas Corpus Petition is disposed of and the detenu is granted Parole for the period commencing from 12.04.2019 at 11.00 A.M till 24.04.2019 at 04.00 P.M and the detenu shall surrender before the Superintendent of Police, Central Prison, Salem at or before 04.00 P.M on 24.04.2019 and it is also open to the respondents to provide sufficient police escort to the detenu for his safety and well being and he also shall extend his maximum cooperation for the same.

Call on 24.04.2019 "For Reporting Compliance".

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CCC)

//True Copy//


Sub Assistant Registrar

sk
To

1. The Home Secretary,
Home Department, Fort St. George,
Chennai.
2. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison, Salem.
3. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.

Copy To
The Section Officer,
Criminal Section, High Court, Madras

(To Post the Matter on 24.04.2019
for Reporting Compliance)

-Inc to Mr.R.Mohamed Saitul'la, Advocate, S.R.No.34954

HCP.No.6 of 2019

PA(CD)
CS/11/04/2019



W.P.No.6682 of 2023

WEB COPY LAW FINDER

Submitted By: Mohamed Saifula
PDF downloaded from the online archives of Chawla Publications(P) Ltd.

28

Radhakrishnan v. Home Secretary (Prison) (Madras)(DB) Law Finder Doc Id # 1732961
(DB) Mad'WN (Cri) 548 : 2020(2) LW (Cri) 467

MADRAS HIGH COURT

(DB)

Before:- N. Krubakaran and V.M. Velumani, JJ.

H.C.P. No. 964 of 2020. Dtd. 13.5.2020.

Radhakrishnan (Male/45) - Petitioner

Versus

The Home Secretary (Prison) Home Department, Secretariat and others - Respondents

For the Petitioner :- M. Mohamed Saifula, Advocate.

For the Respondent :- Ms. M. Prabhavathi, Additional Public Prosecutor.

IMPORTANT

Suspension of sentence - Time limit for disposal of representation - No time limit fixed in Rules for disposal of representation for ordinary leave. To mitigate problems of prisoners and their families, time limit has to be fixed.

A Tamil Nadu Suspension of Sentence Rules, 1982, Rule 19 - Suspension of sentence - Petitioner is life convict who seeks one month's ordinary leave to treat his wife, who is suffering from incisional hernia and also to make arrangements to meet educational expenses of his daughters - Though granting leave oppose on ground that there are two cases pending against petitioner and are in trial stage, Court is inclined to grant ten days leave to petitioner commencing with escort.

[Para 2]

B. Tamil Nadu Suspension of Sentence Rules, 1982, Rule 19 - Suspension of sentence - It is brought to notice of court that police officials accompanying convicts are taking money in name of charges - If it is happening, then it is illegal and it would amount to bribe.

[Para 7]

C. Tamil Nadu Suspension of Sentence Rules, 1982, Rule 19 - Suspension of sentence - No time limit fixed in Rules for disposal of representation for ordinary leave - Except mentioning of word "expeditiously", no time limit has been mentioned anywhere - Merely because, there is no time limit fixed in aforesaid Rules for disposal of representation for ordinary leave, it does not mean that Prison Authorities can sleep over matter - To mitigate problems of prisoners and their families, time limit has to be fixed.

[Paras 12 and 13]



W.P.No.6682 of 2023

WEB COPY



LAW FINDER

Submitted By: Mohamed Saifulla

PDF downloaded from the online archives of Chanda Publications (P) Ltd

ORDER

N. Kirubakaran, J. - The matter was heard through video conferencing.

2. The petitioner is a life convict who seeks one month's ordinary leave to treat his wife, who is suffering from incisional hernia and also to make arrangements to meet the educational expenses of his daughters.

3. Heard Mr.M.Mohamed Saifullah, learned counsel for the petitioner and Ms. M. Prabhavathi, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondents.

4. Though Ms. M. Prabhavathi, learned Additional Public Prosecutor would oppose granting of leave to the petitioner on the ground that there are two cases pending against him and they are in trial stage, taking into consideration that the petitioner had already been granted leave in 2019, the health condition of his wife and also that he has to make arrangements for the educational expenses of his children, this Court is inclined to grant ten days leave to the petitioner commencing from 15.07.2020 till 24.07.2020 with escort.

5. Accordingly, the petitioner namely, D. Radhakrishnan, Sex: DUCASARY, Life Convict Prisoner (C.I. No. -0631) aged 45 years, confined at Central Prison, Salem shall be released on 15.07.2020 at 10a.m with escort and he shall surrender before the Prison Authorities on 24.07.2020 at 9pm. It is made clear that no charges should be collected from the convict.

6. The Jail Authorities during the said period shall provide proper escort to the convict in order to ensure his safety and security. They shall impose suitable conditions to that effect and the convict should also abide by the conditions imposed by the authorities concerned.

7. It is brought to the notice of this Court that the police officials who are accompanying the convicts are taking money in the name of charges. If it is happening, then it is illegal and it would amount to bribe. It is made clear that if any such incident is brought to the notice of this Court, then not only departmental proceedings would be taken against the concerned officials but also action under Prevention of Corruption Act would be taken. The convicts are already languishing in jail and do not have any source of livelihood and their families are already suffering. In spite of the same, these people are fleecing the convicts who come out on parole without any sympathy. Therefore, the Inspector General of Prisons is directed to make it clear that no amount shall be demanded from the convicts when they come out on parole and the convicts shall also be informed about the same so that if any such incident happens, the same can be promptly report to the authorities.

8. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that though the wife of the petitioner had given a representation seeking ordinary leave on 18.09.2019, so far the said representation has not been considered and disposed of by the Authorities. As per Rule 19 of Tamil Nadu Suspension of Sentence Rules, 1982, the Government is the competent authority to issue order of release of prisoners on ordinary leave. The grounds for the grant of ordinary leave have been enumerated under Rule 20 of the said Rules, which is extracted as follows:

"20. Grounds for the grant of ordinary leave:

The grounds for the grant of ordinary leave to a prisoner shall be -

(i) to make arrangements for the livelihood of his family and for the settlement of life etc"



W.P.No.6682 of 2023

WEB COPY LAW FINDER



Submitted By: Mohamed Saifulla
PDF downloaded from the online archives of Chewla Publications(P) Ltd.

30

- (ii) to make arrangements for the admission of the children in the school or college;
- (iii) construction or repairing the homestead;
- *(iv) to make arrangements or to participate in the marriage of the prisoner, sons, daughters, full brother or full sisters, as the case may be, of the prisoner.
- (v) settling family disputes like partition, etc.,
- (vi) agricultural operations like sowing, harvesting etc. and
- (vii) any other extraordinary reasons.]

(*substituted as per G.O.Ms. No. 2358 Home (Prison-V) dated 01.11.1989.)

5. Rule 22 of the said Rules speaks about 'Eligibility for Ordinary Leave' and the same reads as follows:

- (1) No prisoner shall be granted ordinary leave unless he has been sentenced by a court in this State to imprisonment for a term or imprisonment for life for an offence against any law other than a law relating to a matter to which the executive power of the Union Government extends and he has completed *three years of imprisonment from the date of initial imprisonment.)
- (2) The period of ordinary leave shall not exceed one month at a time unless it is extended by Government.
- (3) The prisoner shall be granted the second spell of leave not exceeding one month after the completion of two years of imprisonment from the date on which he returns from the last ordinary leave.
- (4) In cases of prisoners who have got a balance of three years to serve ordinary leave not exceeding one month for each of three years, the year being calculated from the date of his return to prison from last leave, shall be granted so as to enable them to make arrangements for settling the family life after release."

10. The details to be given in the petition for ordinary leave have been stated in Rule 23 and the same is extracted as hereunder:

"23. Petition for Ordinary Leave:

(1) The petition for ordinary leave shall be submitted by the prisoner or by a relative of the said prisoner to the Government direct or sent through the Superintendent of Prison where the prisoner to whom leave is to be granted is confined.

(2) Each petition for ordinary leave shall be accompanied with a statement of the names of two sureties who are willing to execute the bond for the prisoner's release on leave and take care of the prisoner during the period of leave. In the petition, it shall be stated, among other things, the names and addresses of the prisoners' relatives with whom he wishes to stay during his leave period."

11. Rule 24 of the aforesaid Rules speaks about process of petition which is usefully extracted as follows:





WP.No.6682 of 2023

WEB COPY



LAW FINDER

Submitted by: Mohanraj Sathish
PDF downloaded from the online archive of 'Law Finder' (2023) Ltd.

24. Process of petition

All petitions for the grant of ordinary leave submitted to Government or to the Superintendent of Prison shall be referred to Probation Officer concerned for reports on the advisability of the ordinary leave of the prisoner in question. The Probation Officer shall personally enquire into and send his report to the Government or to the Superintendent in Form I. If the Probation Officer feels that the release on leave of a prisoner is likely to involve breach of peace in the locality, he shall consult the local Sub-inspector of Police, solely with a view to avoid any breach of peace and record the views of Sub-inspector of Police in the said Form. In respect of other cases in which there is no likelihood of breach of peace, the Probation Officer shall send his report direct to the Government or to the Superintendent of Prisons without consulting the local Sub-inspector of Police. Where the petition has been submitted to the Superintendent of Prisons, he shall forward the petition along with the reports expeditiously to the Government for orders. The Government may, on consideration of the petition and reports, pass such orders as they deem fit."

12. From the above, it is evident that there is no time limit fixed in the Rules for the disposal of the representation for ordinary leave. Only in Rule 24, it has been stated that when a petition is submitted to the Superintendent of Prisons, he shall forward the petition along with the reports expeditiously to the Government for orders. Except the mentioning of the word 'expeditiously', no time limit has been mentioned anywhere. Merely because, there is no time limit fixed in the aforesaid Rules for the disposal of the representation for ordinary leave, it does not mean that the Prison Authorities can sleep over the matter. The very purpose of giving the representation goes frustrated on account of the delay compelling the prisoners or their family members to approach the Court by filing writ petitions. The convicts and their families are already suffering because of incarceration and even the result of the representation is not given in time, it will be injustice to them. On account of failure to dispose of the representation for ordinary leave or not granting of ordinary leave/parole in time, the parties are compelled to file writ petitions by spending money and it would add insult to the injury.

13. In view of the above position, to mitigate the problems of the prisoners and their families, time limit has to be fixed. Whenever a representation for ordinary leave is received, either by the Government or by the Prison Authorities, the authorities shall get a report from the Probation Officer and local Sub-inspector of Police, if necessary, within one week and along with the reports the Prison Authorities shall forward the same to the Government for passing appropriate orders. After receipt of the representation, the Government shall pass appropriate orders and intimate the same to the relatives or family members of the prisoners or to the prisoners within a period of one week. The above two weeks time limit would do justice to the parties. The aforesaid time limit shall hold good and shall be scrupulously followed by the authorities concerned till Tamil Nadu Suspension of Sentence Rules are amended incorporating two weeks' time in the Rules for the disposal of the petition for grant of ordinary leave. It is made clear that if the parties are compelled to approach the Court on account of failure to dispose of the representation for ordinary leave within the time limit fixed by this Court, the expenses incurred for the legal proceedings initiated by the convicts or their family members shall be borne out by the authority, who failed to dispose of the representation in time.

14. In the result, while allowing the Habeas Corpus Petition granting ordinary leave to the petitioner from 15.07.2020 to 24.07.2020, the following directions are given:

- (i) The Government is directed to make appropriate amendments in the Rules indicating



W.P.No.6682 of 2023

WEB COPY LAW FINDER



Submitted By: Mohamed Saifulla
PDF downloaded from the online archives of Chawla Publications(P) Ltd.

32

weeks' time limit for disposal of the representation for ordinary leave;

(ii) Till such amendment is made, the above time limit shall be in force and shall be scrupulously followed by the authorities;

(iii) If the time limit is not adhered to, it would amount to Contempt of Court and the parties are at liberty to approach this Court with contempt petition.

(iv) The expenses incurred by the parties for approaching the Court for not disposing the representation for ordinary leave shall be borne by the authority who failed to dispose of the representation.

15. Post the H.C.P. for reporting compliance on 27.07.2020.

© Chawla Publications (P) Ltd.

(iii) The aforementioned orders were made by Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court when two cases cited in the impugned order were pending. The two cases cited in the impugned order are pending for more than 10 years.

(iv) In the earlier occasions, when the convict prisoner was granted leave, no uneventful i.e., nothing untoward had happened and the convict prisoner had returned and surrendered after availing the leave.



W.P.No.6682 of 2023

5. We crystallize the order for the sake of specificity and the same is

as follows:

i) Convict prisoner is granted 20 days ordinary leave under Rule 27 of said Rules as he has sought for ordinary leave on medical grounds (there is no dispute about the medical condition) and for arranging funds for his treatment;

ii) 20 days leave shall be from 07.07.2023 to 27.07.2023;

iii) As regards the two cases that are now pending against the convict prisoner, we are informed that C.C.No.101 of 2020 pending on the file of Judicial Magistrate, Sendamangalam, Namakkal is listed for hearing on 30.06.2023 and S.C.No.58 of 2013 pending on the file of II Additional District and Sessions Judge, Salem is listed for hearing on 05.07.2023. As the leave is granted from 07.07.2023, both these Courts are requested to give next dates well after 27.07.2023 so that it does not intercede qua 20 days leave which we are granting;

iv) Convict prisoner shall sign in the jurisdictional Police Station, Thammampatti police station, Salem District every day



W.P.No.6682 of 2023

at 10.30 am;

WEB COPY

v) The convict prisoner shall surrender in Salem Central Prison by dusk at 05.30pm on 27.07.2023.

6. Captioned writ petition is disposed of in the aforesaid manner with the aforesaid directives.

Though captioned writ petition is disposed of by this order, Registry is directed to list the captioned writ petition under the cause list caption 'FOR REPORTING COMPLIANCE' on 01.08.2023.

(M.S.,J.)

(R.S.V.,J.)

23.06.2023

Index : Yes

Speaking order

Neutral Citation : Yes

gpa



W.P.No.6682 of 2023

To

WEB COPY

1. The Home Secretary (Prison)
Home Department, Secretariat
Fort St.George, Chennai
2. The Director General of Prison
Thalaimuthu Natarajar Building
Egmore, Chennai – 600 008
3. The Superintendent of Prison
Salem Central Prison, Hasthampatti – 636 007
4. The Public Prosecutor
Madras High Court, Chennai



WEB COPY



W.P.No.6682 of 2023

M.SUNDAR, J.
and
R.SAKTHIVEL, J.

gpa

W.P.No.6682 of 2023

23.06.2023

Page Nos.19/19