



WEB COPY

W.P.Nos.14543 & 14548 of 2021

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 06.10.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE R. SAKTHIVEL

W.P.Nos.14543 & 14548 of 2021
and W.M.P.Nos.15433, 15438 & 15439 of 2021

V.Alexander ... *Petitioner in WP.No.14543/2021*

T.Saravanan ... *Petitioner in WP.No.14548/2021*

Vs.

1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Registrar,
The State Human Rights Commission – Tamil Nadu,
No.143 – P.S.Kumarasamy Raja Salai,
Greenways Road,
Chennai – 600 028.

3.Thiru. Gajendran ... *Respondents in both WPs*

Common Prayer: Writ Petitions filed under Article 226 of the
Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Certiorari, calling for the



W.P.Nos.14543 & 14548 of 2021

records pertaining to the impugned order dated 27.04.2021 in SHRC Case No.7185, 9126 & 11656 of 2018 and quash the same with regard to the petitioners are concerned insofar as relief (ii) namely the recommendation of the 2nd respondent commission to the 1st respondent to initiate disciplinary action against the petitioners.

(in both WPs)

For Petitioners : Mr.S.Ilamuhil

For R1 : Mr.G.Ameedius,
Government Advocate

For R2 : Mr.T.C.Gopalakrishnan

For R3 : Mr.R.Thirumoorthy

COMMON ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by *M.S.RAMESH, J.*)

On the basis of a news item published in Dinakaran, a daily Tamil newspaper dated 30.08.2018, the State Human Rights Commission – Tamil Nadu (hereinafter referred to as ‘the Commission’) had taken *suo motu* cognizance of an incident that occurred on 28.08.2018, wherein the complainant’s wife namely Renuka had doused herself with petrol and immolated herself in front of the Police Station. The reason for the



W.P.Nos.14543 & 14548 of 2021

occurrence is that there was a civil dispute between the complainant's family and the opposite party namely one Amirthavalli, regarding the usage of a common passage. When the complainant's wife had lodged a complaint to the petitioners herein/Inspector of Police and Sub-Inspector of Police, they had summoned the complainant and his wife to the Police Station and abused Renuka and also threatened to implicate her in a prostitution case. Not able to withstand the torture, she had ran out of the station and immolated herself.

2. The Commission, by its order dated 27.04.2021, passed in SHRC Case Nos.7185, 9126 & 11656 of 2018, had recorded that the petitioners herein had violated the human rights of the complainant and the deceased wife and accordingly, recommended to the Government, to pay a compensation of Rs.3,00,000/- to the complainant, apart from initiation of disciplinary action. This order of the Commission is under challenge before us.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners had not summoned the complainant on the fateful day, but



W.P.Nos.14543 & 14548 of 2021

they were already present in the station to pursue their earlier complaint.

According to him, the petitioners had never caused any violation of human rights and that the Commission had not properly appreciated the evidences let in by them.

4. The learned counsel for the third respondent opposed the submissions and stated that, owing to the inhuman conduct on the part of the petitioners, the third respondent's wife had self-immolated herself outside the Police Station, which fact was substantiated in the inquiry conducted by the Commission.

5. Under Section 12 of the Protection of Human Rights Act, 1993 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act'), the Commission is empowered into complaints of violation of human rights or abetment thereof, either *suo motu* or on a petition presented to it by a victim.

6. In the instant case, the Commission had invoked Section 12 of the Act and had taken *suo motu* cognizance of the newspaper item of the incident that occurred on 28.08.2018, which, in our view, is maintainable.



W.P.Nos.14543 & 14548 of 2021

During the course of inquiry, the Commission had also conducted the investigation through the Investigating Agency by virtue of the powers vested on it under Section 14 of the Act. From the investigation report, the Additional Commissioner of Police (L&O), North Greater Chennai Police, had submitted a report stating that the complainant and the victim were not called upon for inquiry, but had come to the Police Station for an inquiry. The report further states that the husband and wife refused to co-operate during the inquiry and thus, the petitioners had warned them of filing a nuisance case against them. The report also confirms that the victim had went out of the Police Station and self-immolated herself and that she later died in Kilpauk Medical College Hospital. According to the investigation report, the deceased Renuka had set fire to herself in anger and to take vengeance against the Policemen.

7. On the strength of the oral and documentary evidence before it, the Commission had come to the conclusion that the Police personnels had taken side with Amirthavalli by not taking any action against the complaint alleged by the deceased Renuka. It was also recorded that the petitioners had abused her in filthy language and threatened to implicate



W.P.Nos.14543 & 14548 of 2021

her in a nuisance case. It is owing to these findings, the Commission had come to the conclusion that the self-immolation was due to the torture given to the victim by the Police. For the purpose of coming to such a conclusion, reliance was placed on the evidence of R.W.2/petitioner in WP.No.14543 of 2021, wherein he had specifically admitted during cross-examination that the complaint lodged by the deceased against Amirthavalli was treated as CSR.No.659 of 2018 and the same was closed. He also admitted that he had not produced the statement of the witnesses or documents to prove, as to how he had come to the conclusion to close the complaint. The evidence of R.W.2 had also established the fact that the petitioners were favouring Amirthavalli.

8. When it is not in dispute that the deceased had self-immolated herself in front of the Police Station and that she was being inquired by the petitioners and also by taking into account that the findings of the Commission was based on the investigation report conducted by it, as well as the evidences let in by both the petitioners and the complainant, we do not find any perversity in such finding.



W.P.Nos.14543 & 14548 of 2021

WEB COPY

9. The Commission had also arrived at the compensation of Rs.3,00,000/- by taking into account the age of the deceased and her profession as a Nurse, earning about Rs.10,000/- per month and had determined the quantum. In our view, the compensation of Rs.3,00,000/- appears to be justifiable in such circumstances.

10. In the result, we do not find any reasons to interfere with the orders of the Commission and accordingly, the Writ Petitions stand dismissed. No costs. Connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

[M.S.R, J.] [R.S.V, J.]

06.10.2025

Index: Yes
Speaking order
Internet: Yes
Neutral Citation: Yes

Sni



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.14543 & 14548 of 2021

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
R. SAKTHIVEL, J.

Sni

To

1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Registrar,
The State Human Rights Commission – Tamil Nadu,
No.143 – P.S.Kumarasamy Raja Salai,
Greenways Road,
Chennai – 600 028.

W.P.Nos.14543 & 14548 of 2021

06.10.2025