



W.P.No.10 of 2021

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED : 08.09.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **M.SUNDAR**

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **MUMMINENI SUDHEER KUMAR**

W.P.No.10 of 2021

&


W.M.P.No.9 of 2021

Thiru.Theerthagiri
Sub Inspector of Police
Valasaravaakam Police Station
Chennai
Now he presently working as
Sub Inspector of Police
West Zone
Greater Chennai

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Tamilnadu State Human Rights Commission
Represented by its Registrar
143, P.S.Kumarasamy Raja Salai
Greenways Road
Adayar, Chennai - 600 028
2. The Government of Tamilnadu
Rep. by its Joint Secretary to Government
Home (POL - IVA) Department
Secretariat
Chennai - 600 009



W.P.No.10 of 2021

3. The Director General of Police
Office of the Director General of Police
Chennai - 04

4. The Principal Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat, Chennai - 09

5. The Special Secretary to Government
Public (HR) Department
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009

6. Thiru.N.Boobalan
S/o.Narasimmalu

... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of The Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorari calling for the records of the impugned order of the State Human Rights Commission/1st Respondent in its proceedings S.H.R.C.No.8582 of 2018 dated 19.11.2020 and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Ms.L.Meenakshi
for Mr.M.Dinesh

For Respondents : Ms.P.Prema for R1 (SHRC)
Mr.P.Balathandayutham
Special Govt. Pleader for R2 to R5
Mr.R.Sreerangan for R6



W.P.No.10 of 2021

ORDER

WEB COPY

[Order of the Court was made by **M.SUNDAR, J.**]

A complaint dated 05.09.2020 given by sixth respondent (Thiru.N.Boobalan, son of Thiru.Narasimmalu) before us in 'State Human Rights Commission' ['SHRC' for the sake of brevity] complaining of violation of human rights culminated in a 'recommendation dated 19.11.2020 in S.H.R.C Case No.8582 of 2018' [hereinafter 'impugned order' for the sake of convenience] wherein and whereby compensation of Rs.50,000/- to sixth respondent was ordered with a further observation that the same can be recovered from second respondent before SHRC (to be noted, second respondent before SHRC is the sole writ petitioner before us).

2. Mr.R.Sreerangan, learned counsel for sixth respondent submits, on instructions, that sixth respondent is now not pressing the aforesaid 05.09.2020 complaint before SHRC as the matter has been given a quietus as between sixth respondent and writ petitioner. Saying so, learned counsel has made an endorsement in the case file and a scanned reproduction of the same is as follows:




WEB COPY



W.P.No.10 of 2021

In view of the compromise
between the complainant
and Mr. Theerthapathi,
the complainant may
be permitted to withdraw
the complaint lodged
before SHRC.


R. Sreerangan
Counsel for Respondent 6
9/9/2021
08.09.2021

3. In the light of the narrative thus far, we deem it appropriate to say that the impugned order of SHRC stands effaced in its entirety, obviously without expression of any view on merits one way or the other.

Captioned WP has served its purpose and WMP thereat has become infructuous and the same are disposed of as closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

(M.S.,J.)

(M.S.K.,J.)

08.09.2025

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

gpa



W.P.No.10 of 2021

WEB COPY

1. The District Collector
Chennai District Collectorate
Singaravelar Malligai, Chennai
2. The Tahsildar
Ambattur Taluk, Ambattur, Chennai
3. The Executive Engineer
Zone VII, Greater Chennai Corporation
Chennai - 600 053



WEB COPY



W.P.No.10 of 2021

**M.SUNDAR, J.,
and
MUMMINENI SUDHEER KUMAR, J.,**

gpa

W.P.No.10 of 2021

08.09.2025