



W.P.No.26545 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED :11.09.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

W.P No.26545 of 2023 and
W.M.P.No.25949 of 2023

K.Jeyamurugan

...Petitioner

Vs.

The Regional Transport Authority,
Office of the Regional Transport Authority,
Pollachi, Coimbatore.

...Respondent

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondent, to return the petitioner Original Driving License bearing No.TN 3719900000537, without any endorsement and within a specified time as may fixed by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Krishnaswamy

For Respondent : Mr.N.Naveenkumar
Government Advocate

ORDER

The petitioner herein seeks a direction to the respondent to return his Original Driving Licence bearing No. TN3719900000537.



W.P.No.26545 of 2023

2. According to the petitioner, he is working as a Driver in Tamil

Nadu State Transport Corporation, Coimbatore Limited. On 15.08.2023, when he was driving the bus belonged to his employer, a motor cycle which was driven in the rash and negligent manner hit the bus and as a consequence, a motor cycle rider died. On 15.08.2023, a criminal case was registered against the petitioner in Crime No.374 of 2023 on th file of Anamalai Police Station, under Sections 279 & 337 of IPC and the said case is pending at the investigation stage. On the very same day, the Police from Anamalai Police Station seized the petitioner's original driving licence and forwarded the same to the respondent herein for taking necessary action.

3.The petitioner herein submitted a representation dated 01.09.2023 to the respondent, requesting him to return the original driving licence. However, till date, the respondent has not returned the original driving licence of the petitioner. Therefore, the petitioner is not in a position to report to the duty.

4. Mr.N.Naveenkumar, learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondent, on instructions, submitted that the respondent has not



W.P.No.26545 of 2023

received any representation from the petitioner seeking return of the original driving licence.

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

6. 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 respondent is not justified in retaining the driving licence especially without passing any order for suspension of the same in accordance with law.

7. 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 held that the licensing authority is not entitled to pre-conclude the issue and



W.P.No.26545 of 2023

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 petition,



W.P.No.26545 of 2023

WEB COPY

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.”

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

9. In view of the stand taken by the learned counsel for the



W.P.No.26545 of 2023

respondent that the petitioner has not submitted any representation seeking return of the original driving licence, the petitioner is directed to give a written representation to the respondent seeking return of original driving licence. If any such representation is submitted by the petitioner, the respondent is directed to hand over the original driving licence bearing No.TN 3719900000537 to the petitioner immediately.

10. However, the order passed by this Court will not preclude the 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 he shall pass orders on merits, after hearing the petitioner in accordance with law.

11. With the above direction, this Writ Petition is allowed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

11.09.2023

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes/No
Speaking Order/Non-Speaking Order
Neutral Citation Case : Yes/No
nti
Note: Issue order copy on 12.09.2023

S.SOUNTHAR, J.



W.P.No.26545 of 2023

nti

To
WEB COPY

The Regional Transport Authority,
Office of the Regional Transport Authority,
Pollachi, Coimbatore.

W.P No.26545 of 2023
and
W.M.P.No.25949 of 2023

11.09.2023