



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 07.02.2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.ANAND VENKATESH

W.P.No.2702 of 2024

A.Balaji

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Collector,
Collectorate Offices,
Thiruvannamalai District.

2.The Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Superintendent of Police,
Thiruvannamalai District.

3.The Inspector of Police,
Mangalam Police Station,
Mangalam,
Thiruvannamalai District.

...Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, pleaded to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the 1st respondent to remove the petitioner's name from the rowdy list based on the petitioner representation dated 08.10.2021.



For Petitioner : Mr.M.Selvam
For Respondents : Mr.A.Damodaran
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed for the issue of writ of Mandamus directing the 1st respondent to remove the petitioner's name from the rowdy list based on the petitioner representation dated 08.10.2021.

2.The case of the petitioner is that the in the year 2000, he was implicated as an accused in the criminal case. After conducting the trial, petitioner was acquitted from all the charges by the Court below. Thereafter, he did not commit any offence and there was no criminal case registered against the petitioner. While so, when the above case was pending against the petitioner, his name was added in the History Sheet which is maintained by the 3rd respondent. Even after being exonerated from all charges, the petitioner's name is still maintained in the History Sheet.

3.The grievance of the petitioner is that the 3rd respondent continues to retain the name of the petitioner in the history sheet and in order to justify the same, attempts are being made to initiate proceedings under section 110 of Cr.P.C. The petitioner made a representation on 08.10.2021 to remove his name from the



history sheet. Since the same was not considered, the present writ petition has been filed before this Court.

4. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.A.Damodaran, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of respondents.

5. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, there shall be a direction to the 3rd respondent to act on the representation made by the petitioner and deal with the same in accordance with the guidelines issued by this Court in *[Sabari @ Sabarigiri Vs. Assistant Commissioner of Police, Anna Nagar, (L&O) Range, Maurai city, Madurai and others]* in 2018 4 MLJ CrL 585 and in *[Thirumurugan and another Vs. The Superintendent of Police, Madurai]* reported in 2020 2 LW crl 266 and pass appropriate orders, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The petitioner is directed to make a fresh representation to the 3rd respondent along with a copy of this order.



N.ANAND VENKATESH, J

WEB COPY

SSR

6.This writ petition is disposed of with the above directions. No costs.

07.02.2024

Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes/No

Speaking/Non-Speaking Order

ssr

To

- 1.The Collector,
Collectorate Offices,
Thiruvannamalai District.
- 2.The Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Superintendent of Police,
Thiruvannamalai District.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
Mangalam Police Station,
Mangalam,
Thiruvannamalai District.
- 4.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

W.P.No.2702 of 2024