



W.P.Crl.No.1210 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 29.10.2025

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE **A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA**

W.P.Crl.No.1210 of 2025

Gokulakrishnan

...Petitioner

Vs.

1. The District Superintendent of Police,
District Superintendent of Police Office,
Tiruppur District.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Gudimangalam Police Station,
Gudimangalam, Udumalpet Taluk,
Tiruppur District.

...Respondents

Writ Petition (Criminal) filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus to direct the 1st respondent to consider the petitioner representation dated 19.08.2025 and consequently directing the 2nd respondent to remove his name from the rowdy list record, within stipulated time fixed by this Hon'ble Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Kumarasamy

For Respondents : Mr.K.M.D.Muhilan, Addl. Public Prosecutor



W.P.Crl.No.1210 of 2025

ORDER

WEB COPY This Writ Petition (Criminal) has been filed seeking a direction to the 1st respondent to consider the petitioner's representation dated 19.08.2025 and to consequently direct the 2nd respondent to remove the petitioner's name from the rowdy list record.

2. Mr.K.M.D.Muhilan, learned Additional Public Prosecutor takes notice on behalf of the respondents. In view of the consent expressed by the learned counsel on either side, this writ petition is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage itself.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner married one Sneha on 23.02.2023 and through their wedlock, they were blessed with one male child and the petitioner is leading a decent life and he has good reputation among public. While so, the petitioner was falsely implicated in a case registered in Crime No.226 of 2019 on the file of the 2nd respondent for the offences under Sections 294(b), 307 & 506(ii) of IPC. After trial, the petitioner was acquitted from the said case and except the



said case, no other case was registered against the petitioner. However, the 2nd respondent, in order to harass the petitioner and restrict his movements, included the petitioner's name in a History Sheeted Rowdy Book, that too, without following the rules and principles for maintaining a history sheet. Further, the petitioner is also being compelled to appear before the respondent police under the pretext of enquiry in a routine manner. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner made a representation dated 19.08.2025 before the 1st respondent seeking to remove his name from the History Sheet maintained by the 2nd respondent. However, till date, no orders have been passed on the said representation. Hence, this writ petition.

4. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender indulging in rowdy activities, extortion, etc. Therefore, a History Sheeted Rowdy Book was opened against him and the same is being periodically extended as per the Police Standing Orders. However, he fairly submitted that the competent authority to consider the petitioner's claim is only the Deputy Superintendent of Police. However, no such representation/claim has been



W.P.Crl.No.1210 of 2025

made by the petitioner before the concerned Deputy Superintendent of police. If any such representation is made by the petitioner before the jurisdictional Deputy Superintendent of Police, appropriate orders will be passed on the same, within the time stipulated by this Court.

5. Heard the learned counsel on either side and perused the materials available on record.

6. The issue involved in this Writ Petition has already been dealt with by the Madurai Bench of this Court, wherein a detailed order was passed in **W.P.(MD) No.19651 of 2017 on 26.09.2018**. Based on the 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 insofar as history sheeters are concerned:

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 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 sub-categorization as, close watch bad characters and non-close 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**”.*

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 sheet 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 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 sheetee, beyond the stipulated period.

7. In view of the above circular passed by the Director General of Police, Chennai and also considering the fair submission made by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, this Court directs the petitioner to make a fresh representation before the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Udumalpet, seeking removal of his name from the History Sheeted Rowdy book within a period of two (2) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Upon such representation being made, the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Udumalpet shall consider the same and pass appropriate orders on merits and in accordance with law, within a period of six (6) weeks.

8. With the aforesaid directions, this Writ Petition (Criminal) stands disposed of. No costs.



W.P.Crl.No.1210 of 2025

WEB COPY 9. Registry is directed to mark a copy of this order to the Deputy

Superintendent of Police, Udumalpet.

29.10.2025

skt

Index : Yes/No
Speaking order : Yes/No
NCC : Yes/No

To:

1. The District Superintendent of Police,
District Superintendent of Police Office,
Tiruppur District.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Gudimangalam Police Station,
Gudimangalam, Udumalpet Taluk,
Tiruppur District.
3. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Udumalpet.
4. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.



WEB COPY



W.P.Crl.No.1210 of 2025

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

skt

W.P.Crl.No.1210 of 2025

29.10.2025