



WP(MD)Nos.180, 867 and 907 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 12.01.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE B.PUGALENDHI

**WP(MD)Nos.180, 867 and 907 of 2024 and
WMP(MD)Nos.203, 880 and 929 of 2024**

WP(MD)No.180 of 2024

A.Natchathiraraj

... Petitioner

Vs

1.The Deputy Transport Commissioner,
Office of the Deputy Transport Commissioner,
Thanjavur,
Thanjavur District.

2.The Regional Transport Officer,
Licensing Authority,
Office of the Regional Transport Office,
Pudukottai, Pudukottai District.

3.The Inspector of Police,
Pudukottai Town Police Station,
Pudukottai District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of writ of certiorarified mandamus to call for the records pertaining to the impugned order in show cause No.TN55/2023/259 dated 18.10.2023 on the file of the respondent No.2 and consequential impugned order in Se.Mu.Aa.No.



WP(MD)Nos.180, 867 and 907 of 2024

1779/A2/2023 dated 17.11.2023 on the file of the respondent No.1 and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents to return the petitioner's original driving licence bearing DL.No.TN5119890000091 to him within the time as fixed by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Balaji

For Respondents : Mr.A.Balasubramaniam,

Additional Government Pleader

WP(MD)No.867 of 2024

L.Muthukumaran

... Petitioner

Vs

1.The Regional Transport Officer,
The Regional Transport Office,
Virudhunagar.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Tiruchuli Police Station,
Tiruchuli, Virudhunagar District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of writ of certiorarified mandamus after calling for the records from the 1st respondent relating to his impugned order dated 20.12.2023 passed in proceedings show cause No.TN67/2023/1316, quash the same and consequently direct the 1st respondent to return the driving license of the petitioner without any remarks, award cost.



WP(MD)Nos.180, 867 and 907 of 2024

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Arunachalam

For Respondent : Mr.R.Suresh Kumar

No.1 Additional Government Pleader

For Respondent : Mr.M.Vaikkam Karunanidhi

No.2 Government Advocate (Crl Side)

WP(MD)No.907 of 2024

P.Panneerselvam

... Petitioner

Vs

1.The Regional Transport Officer,
The Regional Transport Office,
Thanjavur.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Tamil University Police Station,
Thanjavur.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of writ of certiorarified mandamus after calling for the records from the 1st respondent relating to the impugned order dated 02.01.2024 passed in proceeding Che.Mu.Aa.En.52526/Ee3/2023, quash the same and consequently direct the 1st respondent to return the driving liencse of the petitioner without any remarks, award cost.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Arunachalam

For Respondent : Mr.G.V.Vairam Santhosh

No.1 Additional Government Pleader

For Respondent : Mr.M.Vaikkam Karunanidhi

No.2 Government Advocate



WP(MD)Nos.180, 867 and 907 of 2024

ORDER

WEB COPY

These writ petitions are filed as against the impugned orders passed by the Regional Transport Officer / Licensing Authority concerned, in and by which, the driving licence of the petitioners were suspended under Section 19(1)(d)&(f) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 with Rule 21 of the Central Motor Vehicle Rules, 1989.

2.The learned Counsel for the petitioners submit that the petitioners are working as Drivers in the Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation. While they were on duty as Drivers, accidents had occurred due to which, cases were registered as against these petitioners under Section 304 (A) IPC for causing death by negligence and the respondent Police seized the driving license of these petitioners without giving any show cause to the petitioners and further forwarded the seized licenses to the Regional Transport Officers concerned, who in turn, have suspended the driving licenses of the petitioners. The cases registered as against the petitioners are under investigation and not even charge sheet has been filed so far. While so, before even any decision is taken by the trial Court, the authorities came to the conclusion that the petitioners are guilty for the



WP(MD)Nos.180, 867 and 907 of 2024

offences committed. The learned Counsel further submit that the Regional Transport Officer cannot act as a pre-judge to take decision on the guilt even before filing of charge sheet before the Court concerned and without even any materials. Therefore, the impugned orders are liable to be set aside.

3.The learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the Transport Authority submits that the petitioners are accused of an offence under Section 304(A) IPC and it is a cognizable offence. If any cognizable offence is committed, the authority after giving reasonable opportunity to the person concerned is empowered to suspend the license as per Section 19 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1981 read with Rule 21 of the Central Motor Vehicle Rules, 1989. Accordingly the petitioners were issued with show cause notices and being not satisfied with the reply given by the petitioners, the impugned orders came to be passed. Therefore, there is no reason to interfere with the impugned orders.

4.This Court considered the rival submissions made and perused the materials placed on record.



WP(MD)Nos.180, 867 and 907 of 2024

5.The petitioners are the Drivers of the Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation. While they were on duty in driving the bus, accidents had occurred and cases were registered as against these petitioners under Section 304(A) IPC for causing death by negligence and subsequently their driving licences were suspended for a temporary period. The grievance of the petitioners is that before filing of any final report as against the petitioners, the authorities pre-judged that the petitioners have committed the offence and therefore, they are before this Court.

6.A Division Bench of this Court in [P.Sethuraman Vs. The Licensing Authority, The Regional Transport Officer, The Regional Transport Officer, Dindigul] in 2010 Writ Law reporter 100 has held as under:

“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.



WP(MD)Nos.180, 867 and 907 of 2024

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.”

7.A similar view has been taken by another Division Bench in S.Murugan Vs Licensing Authority [WA(MD)No.176 of 2009 dated 22.06.2009 Madurai Bench of Madras High Court]. However a Division Bench of this Court in S.Krishnan Vs The Licensing Authority [in WA(MD)No.783 of 2008] has held as follows:

“Section 19 itself gives the power to the authority to disqualify a person from holding a driving licence when the licensing authority is satisfied after giving notice to the licensee and enumerated 10 disqualification clauses. One among them was Section 19(1)(C) which clearly states that when the vehicle is used and a cognizable offence is made out all that is required is the authority should satisfy itself whether the petitioner has utilized the vehicle which resulted in a cognizable offence. Admittedly, this appellant used the vehicle and caused the death of a person.”



WP(MD)Nos.180, 867 and 907 of 2024

8. Following the above cited judgments, a single judge of this Court in WP No.11 of 2023 has discussed the issue elaborately. The seizure power of the police under Section 206 of the Act is limited only in circumstances that if the offence has been committed any of the Sections under Sections 183, 184, 185, 189, 190, 194 (c) 194(d) and 194(e) under Sub Section 4 of Section 206 of the Motor Vehicle Act and therefore, held that the power of seizure vested with the police under Section 206 is not automatic. The officer has to record the reasons to believe any of the circumstances narrated under Section 206 as directed he can exercise such power. Recording so this Court has held as under :

“19. In such a view of the matter, this court is of the view that seizure of the licence to take action under section 19 is not a mandatory. Irrespective of licence being surrendered or produced before the authorities, the action can be initiated by the authorities under Section 19 on the report submitted by the police. Therefore, this Court is of the view that merely on the basis of the FIR is registered particularly in the other IPC offences, the police officer cannot have power to seize the licence. If at all any action is contemplated under Section 19, they may forward a report to the concerned RTA to take action under Section 19 of the Act. On such report the licensing authority is



WP(MD)Nos.180, 867 and 907 of 2024

satisfied any of the contingencies in clauses 1(a) to (h) of Section 19 and sub~clause 1A of the Act and after giving an opportunity to the holder of the licence may pass an order as contemplated in Section 19 of the Act.

20. Accordingly this Court hold that the seizure of the licence in the given case is not valid in the eye of law and the 2nd Respondent is directed to return the licence within one week from the date of receipt of copy of this order. It is well open to the 1st Respondent to send a report to the RTA for taking appropriate action. The RTA may after providing opportunity to the petitioner may proceed under Section 19 of the M.V. Act and to pass an order on merits.”

9. In view of the above discussion, this Court is of the view that the respondent police cannot seize the driving license. Further it is not for the Regional Transport Authority to pre-judge the guilt of the petitioners, even before filing of the final report by the respondent Police in the criminal cases registered against these petitioners. Therefore, these writ petitions are disposed of in the following terms:

- i. The impugned orders are set aside.
- ii. The respondent RTO is directed to return the driving licence of these



WP(MD)Nos.180, 867 and 907 of 2024

petitioners within a period of one week from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

iii.It is open to the respondent Police to forward the relevant materials to the RTO after filing of the final reports in the criminal cases registered against these petitioners.

iv. On receipt of any such materials from the respondent Police, the respondent RTO shall take appropriate action as stipulated under Section 19 of the Motor Vehicles Act.

10.The writ petitions are disposed of in the above terms. No costs. Consequently connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

12.01.2024

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
NCC : Yes / No

dsk



WP(MD)Nos.180, 867 and 907 of 2024

To

1. The Deputy Transport Commissioner,
Office of the Deputy Transport Commissioner,
Thanjavur,
Thanjavur District.
2. The Regional Transport Officer,
Licensing Authority,
Office of the Regional Transport Office,
Pudukottai, Pudukottai District.
3. The Inspector of Police,
Pudukottai Town Police Station,
Pudukottai District.
4. The Regional Transport Officer,
The Regional Transport Office,
Virudhunagar.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Tiruchuli Police Station,
Tiruchuli,
Virudhunagar -District.
6. The Regional Transport Officer,
The Regional Transport Office,
Thanjavur.
7. The Inspector of Police,
Tamil University Police Station,
Thanjavur.



WEB COPY



WP(MD)Nos.180, 867 and 907 of 2024

B.PUGALENDHI, J.

dsk

WP(MD)Nos.180, 867 and 907 of 2024

12.01.2024