



WEB COPY



WP.Crl.No.1086

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 23.10.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN

W.P.Crl.No. 22328 of 2021

Kanmaniselvi

... Petitioner

Versus

1. The Deputy Inspector General of Prisons (DIG)

Chennai Range

Prison Head Quarters, Whannels Road

Egmore, Chennai - 600 008

2. The Superintendent of Prison

Central Prison-1

Puzhal, Chennai - 600 066

.. Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records No.33800/Tha Ku2/2025 dated 02.06.2025 passed by the second respondent and quash the portion of the leave granted with condition of two sureies of Rs.500/- each executed before the Tahsildar, Perambur, Chennai and consequently direct the respondents to grant 28 days ordinary leave to the petitioner's brother Dhandapani, S/o.Janagiraman, aged 36 years, convict prisoner, CT.No.6046, PID.No.33800, now confined in the Central Prison-1, Puzhal, Chennai – 66.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Pugalenth

For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan

Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by **N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.**)



The petitioner challenges the condition imposed while granting ordinary leave to her brother one Dhandapani vide order dated 02.06.2025 passed by the second respondent/Superintendent of Prison and also seeks for a consequential direction for the respondents to grant 28 days ordinary leave to the petitioner's brother.

2. The petitioner's brother was convicted by the learned Sessions Judge, Mahila Court, Chennai punishable under Section 302 of IPC and sentenced to life imprisonment by judgment dated 28.09.2015. The petitioner's brother had made an application for grant of 28 days of ordinary leave for the purpose of renovating the damaged house and also for the treatment of the petitioner. The second respondent vide impugned order had granted ordinary leave for 28 days and imposed the condition execute the bond for Rs.500/- with two sureties each executed before the Tahsildar, Perambur, Chennai. Challenging such condition imposed by the Prison Authority, the petitioner has come up with the present petition.

3. Heard both sides and perused the materials placed on record.

4. At the outset, we are of the view that the condition imposed by the Prison Authority is only nominal; what was required is only to execute Rs.500 with two sureties each before the Tahsildar, Perambur, Chennai, *ergo*, we are of the view that



WP.Crl.No.1086

such condition imposed by the Prison Authority is not onerous. If at all the petitioner's brother intends to avail leave, necessarily, he has to abide the condition imposed by the Prison Authority for grant of such leave.

5. Such view of the matter, we do not find any merits in this petition and accordingly, this petition stands dismissed. No costs.

(N.S.K., J.) (M.J.R., J.)

23.10.2025

Index : yes/no
Internet : yes/no
dhk

N. SATHISH KUMAR, J.
and
M. JOTHIRAMAN, J.

dhk

To,

1. The Deputy Inspector General of Prisons (DIG)
Chennai Range
Prison Head Quarters, Whannels Road
Egmore, Chennai - 600 008
2. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison-1
Puzhal, Chennai - 600 066
3. The Public Prosecutor
Madras High Court

W.P.Crl.No. 1086 of 2025



WEB COPY



WP.Crl.No.1086

23.10.2025