

W.P.(Crl.) No.769 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED : 08.09.2025

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

W.P.(Crl.) No.769 of 2025

M.P.Anbuselvan

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The Superintendent of Police,
O/o. The Superintendent of Police,
Myladuthurai District.
- 2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
O/o. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Myladuthurai Range,
Myladuthurai District.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
Sembanarkovil Police Station,
Myladuthurai District.

... Respondents

Prayer: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to remove the petitioner name in the History Sheet H.S.No.30 of 2015 maintaining by the third respondent in pursuant to petitioner representation dated 21.05.2025.



WEB COPY



W.P.(Crl.) No.769 of 2025

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Muthamizhselvakumar

For Respondents : Mr.R.Vinothraja, GA (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The present Writ Petition has been filed seeking a direction to the respondents to remove the petitioner's name in the History Sheet H.S.No.30 of 2015 maintained by the third respondent in pursuant to the petitioner's representation dated 21.05.2025.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing on behalf of the respondents.

3. The issue involved in this Criminal Original Petition has already been dealt with by the Madurai Bench of this Court and detailed order has been passed in W.P.(MD) No. 19651 of 2017 on 26.09.2018. On the basis of the above said order, the Director General of Police, Chennai issued a circular in Rc.No.66569/Crime 3(2)/2019 dated 24.04.2019, which reads as follows :-

“7.From the above judgments, the following principles emerge in so far as history sheeters are concerned:-



WEB COPY

a. In order to facilitate the study of crime and criminals, the Police Standing Orders provides a mechanism, whereby every Police Station shall maintain a crime history, which shall be a confidential record. In this record all cases of crime that are mentioned in PSO No.742, which provides various classes of crime, shall be entered and even an attempt to commit those offences, are entered in the records maintained in the Police Station.

b. These crime records maintained by the Various Police Stations shall be reviewed every year by the Inspector of Police of the concerned Police Station. On such review, the Inspector of Police has to furnish a concise appreciation of the year's crime for the benefit of the Superior Officers and also to make suggestions in order to improve the quality of crime control. The review undertaken by the Inspector of Police is not merely a catalogue of the crime in the year. It should reflect the valuable suggestions in order to prevent such crimes in future and to provide ways and means of handling serious offences in an effective manner.

c. History Sheet can be opened by the concerned Police Station under two circumstances. The first circumstance is



WEB COPY

provided under PSO No.746, which states that the history sheet can be opened against a person who is a resident (permanently or temporarily) within the station limit, who is known or believed to be addicted to commission of crime, whether convicted or not. Here the thrust is on the habituality or the propensity to commit a crime by a person, which is sought to be monitored by opening a history sheet.

d. The second category of persons against whom history sheet can be opened are the persons, who are convicted for various offences that has been listed in PSO No.747, wherein opening of the history sheet is automatic.

e. In the first category of opening history sheet, month wise scrutiny or a close watch on the person concerned is contemplated. Here also there is subcategorization as, close watch bad characters and nonclose watch bad characters. In the former, the entry shall be made month wise and in the later, the entry shall be made once in a quarter. What is entered is normally anything of interest in respect of the bad character, which goes to the notice of the Police. These records must be checked and brought upto date once in a year. Here the main thrust is on “Current Doings”.




WEB COPY

f. In the second category of opening history sheet, a mere act of conviction under the offences listed in PSO No.747 is enough.

The name of the persons, who have been convicted for those offences can be retained for a period of two years after their release from jail.

g. PSO No.748, is the most important provision, which deals with discontinuance of history sheet. This provision is common to both the categories falling under PSO Nos.746 and 747. As per PSO No.748, THE Superintendent of Police may order a closure of a history sheet at any time. But, the Divisional Officer can order closure of history sheet only after the expiry of the period stipulated in PSO No.747.

h. As per PSO 748, where retention of the history sheet is considered to be necessary, even after two years of registration, orders of an Officer of and above the rank of Assistant Superintendent of Police/ Deputy Superintendent of Police must be taken for extension for the first instance upto the end of next December. For further annual extension from January to December, separate orders must be passed every time by an Officer of and above the rank of Assistant Superintendent of Police /



Deputy Superintendent of Police. This provision is made applicable even for rowdy sheeters.

i. For the purpose of passing such orders, there must be valid materials available on record and it cannot be passed on the whims and fancies of the Police Officers. Therefore, the authority empowered to extend the period of retention of the names of the persons in the history sheet, should record his reasons based on both objective and subjective instructions.

j. Branding a person as a history sheeted rowdy, taints the name and image of the person. It is true that the entire purpose of maintaining a history sheet is to ensure public peace. However, it should be balanced with the fundamental right guaranteed to every citizen under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. Therefore, a fair and reasonable decision, based on the materials, with sufficient reasons, becomes sine qua non to retain the name of a person as a history sheeter beyond the period stipulated in the Police Standing Orders.

k. This Court has time and again brought the above principle to the notice of the Higher Police Officials and in one of the judgments in Manivanan Vs. State represented by The District



Collector, Coimbatore District and Others, reported in (2013) 7

WEB COPY

MLJ 501, this Court felt that there is lack of understanding on the part of the Police in maintaining history sheet and therefore, directed the Director General of Police to issue necessary instructions / guidelines / circulars with regard to the manner in which it has to be maintained and the manner in which the orders will have to be passed for extension of the period to continue a person as a history sheet.

8.The above principles that has been culled out of various decisions of this Court will now be applied to each case in order to see if the Police officials have scrupulously followed all the Police Standing Orders and the judgments of this Court, while retaining the name of a person as a history sheet, beyond the stipulated period.

4. On perusal of the affidavit, it is seen that the case as against the petitioner has been registered by the third respondent for an unauthorised protest and no adverse records against the petitioner. Furthermore, no other cases have been registered against the petitioner herein.



W.P.(Crl.) No.769 of 2025

WEB COPY

5. In such view of the matter, the petitioner is directed to give a fresh representation to the respondents, within a period of 10 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and on such representation being made, the respondents shall consider the case of the petitioner and pass an order on the basis of the circular issued by the Director General of Police in Rc.No.66569/Crime 3(2)/2019 dated 24.04.2019, within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a fresh representation from the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, this Writ Petition stands disposed of. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed. There shall be no orders as to costs.

08.09.2025

Index:Yes/No

NCC :Yes/No

DP



W.P.(CrI.) No.769 of 2025

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Superintendent of Police,
O/o. The Superintendent of Police,
Myladuthurai District.
- 2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
O/o. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Myladuthurai Range,
Myladuthurai District.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
Sembanarkovil Police Station,
Myladuthurai District.
- 4.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.



WEB COPY



W.P.(Crl.) No.769 of 2025

N.SATHISH KUMAR.J.

DP

W.P.(Crl.) No.769 of 2025

08.09.2025