



WEB COPY



W.P.No.24485 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21.08.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

W.P No.24485 of 2023

M.Krishnamoorthi

Vs.

...Petitioner

1.The State Rep.by its
Inspector of Police
K-10, Traffic Investigation Wing
Koyembedu Police Station
Chennai 600 107
Crime No.141/2023.

2.The Licensing Authority-cum
Regional Transport Officer
Poonamallee
Chennai 603 056.

...Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the second respondent herein to return the original driving license (DL.No.TN-25-Z-19930000722) to the petitioner forthwith.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.24485 of 2023

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Vinod

For Respondents : Mr.C.E.Pratap for R1
Government Advocate

Mr.P.Anandha Kumar for R2
Government Advocate

ORDER

The petitioner herein seeks a direction to the second respondent to return his original driving licence.

2. According to the petitioner, he is a bus driver of Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation, Villupuram Division. On 20.07.2023, when he was driving the bus belonged to his employer near Porur Water Treatment Plant, an accident was caused by an Alto Car and as a consequence a pedestrian died. However, the first respondent registered the First Information Report against the driver of the Alto Car and the petitioner herein in Crime No.141 of 2023 under Sections 279 & 304 -A of IPC and the said case is pending investigation.

3. The first respondent seized the original driving licence of the petitioner and forwarded the same to the second respondent. The petitioner



W.P.No.24485 of 2023

requested the return of the original driving licence. However, till date, the second respondent has not returned the original driving licence of the petitioner. Therefore, the petitioner is not in a position to report to duty.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the accident did not occur due to the negligence of the petitioner and therefore, the second respondent is not justified in retaining the original driving licence without passing any order in accordance with law.

5. Admittedly, only an FIR is pending against the petitioner and investigation is still going on. Till date, no charge sheet has been filed against the petitioner. In such circumstances, the second respondent is not justified in retaining the driving licence especially without passing any order for suspension of the same in accordance with law.

6. The issue involved in this matter is covered by the decision of the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in the case of ***P. Sethuram Vs. The Licensing Authority, The Regional Transport Officer, The Regional Transport Office, Dindigul, reported in 2010 Writ L.R.100***, wherein it was



W.P.No.24485 of 2023

held that the licensing authority is not entitled to pre-conclude the issue and come to a conclusion that the petitioner is guilty of rash and negligent driving even before the Criminal Court or Motor Accident Tribunal gives a formal finding to that effect. The relevant portion of the decision of the Hon'ble Division Bench reads thus:

“8. A bare reading of Section 19(1) shows that the Licensing Authority has the power to revoke any licence or disqualify a person for a specified period from holding or obtaining a driving licence, if any of the contingencies prescribed in Clauses (a) to (h) of sub-section (1) of Section 19 arises. Moreover, the power under Section 19(1) can be invoked only after giving an opportunity of being heard to the holder of the licence and for reasons to be recorded in writing.

9. But in the case on hand, the licence of the appellant was impounded or retained by the police immediately after the accident. Thereafter, the respondent issued the show cause notice under Section 19 (1) of the Act, after getting a report from the police. Therefore, the impounding of the licence has actually preceded the issue of show cause notice.

10. Apart from the above, there is no allegation, either in the notice or in the order impugned in the writ



W.P.No.24485 of 2023

WEB COPY

petition, that the appellant is a habitual criminal or habitual drunkard, so as to attract Clause (a) of Section 19(1) of the Act. Similarly, neither the show cause notice nor the order impugned in the writ petition, imputes the appellant with any of the ingredients necessary under Clause (b) to (h) of Sub Section (1) of Section 19 of the Act. Except stating that as per the report of the Inspector of Police, the appellant was guilty of rash and negligent driving, the impugned order does not indicate the category in Clause (a) to (h) of Section 19(1), under which the case of the appellant would fall.

11. The respondent has, in the impugned order, preconcluded the issue that the appellant is guilty of rash and negligent driving, even before the Criminal Court or the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal went into the issue. Even to invoke Section 19(1) (c), it is necessary to show that the Motor Vehicle is used in the commission of a cognizable offence. Without making a specific averment regarding the same, the order suspending the driving licence cannot be taken to be passed after due application of mind.”

7. The law laid down by the Hon'ble Division Bench in the above said case law is squarely applicable to the case on hand.



W.P.No.24485 of 2023

WEB COPY

8. The second respondent is not entitled to retain the driving licence of the petitioner without passing any order and that too after hearing the petitioner. In such circumstances, the prayer in the Writ Petition is deserved to be allowed and consequently, the second respondent is directed to hand over the original driving licence (DL No.TN-25-Z-19930000722) to the petitioner immediately.

9. However, the order passed by this Court will not preclude the second respondent from initiating any action under Section 19(1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 r/w Rule 21 of Central Motor Vehicles Rules, 1989 and pass orders on merits, after hearing the petitioner in accordance with law.

10. With the above direction, this Writ Petition is allowed. No costs.

21.08.2023

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes/No
Speaking Order/Non-Speaking Order
Neutral Citation Case : Yes/No



W.P.No.24485 of 2023



WEB COPY



W.P.No.24485 of 2023

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police
K-10, Traffic Investigation Wing
Koyembedu Police Station
Chennai 600 107
Crime No.141/2023.
- 2.The Licensing Authority-cum
Regional Transport Officer
Poonamallee
Chennai 603 056.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.24485 of 2023

S.SOUNTHAR, J.
dna

W.P.No.24485 of 2023

21.08.2023