



W.P.(MD)No.2511 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 29.01.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

W.P.(MD)No.2511 of 2025

Jaya Edwin

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State rep., by
The Superintendent of Police,
O/o., The Superintendent of Police,
Karuvelanaickenpatti, Vadaveeranaickanpatti,
Theni DISTRICT.

2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
O/o., Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Uthampalayam, Theni District.

3.The Inspector of Police,
Gudalur North Police Station,
Gudalur, Theni District.
Crime No.150 of 1991

4.The Sub Inspector of Police,
Kumuli Police Station,
Lower Camp, Theni District.

... Respondents

PRAYER : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking a Writ of Mandamus, to direct the respondents 1 to 4 to



W.P.(MD)No.2511 of 2025

delete the name of the petitioner from the History sheet number not known to the petitioner on the file of the third and fourth respondents based on the petitioner's representation dated 02.06.2024 and 22.07.2024 within the time period stipulated by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Vanchinathan

For Respondents : Mr.E.Antony Sahaya Prabahar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

The prayer sought for in the present writ petition is to direct the respondents 1 to 4 to delete the name of the petitioner from the History sheet number not known to the petitioner on the file of the third and fourth respondents based on the petitioner's representation dated 02.06.2024 and 22.07.2024.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been implicated as accused in several cases, out of which, some cases are disposed of and some cases are pending and as of now, no criminal cases are pending against the petitioner. Despite this, the third and fourth respondents included the petitioner's name in the



W.P.(MD)No.2511 of 2025

history sheet, without any material evidence. Therefore, on 22.07.2024, the petitioner sent a representation to the respondents through registered post, narrating the entire set of facts, and requested the removal of his name from the history sheet. However, no action has been taken so far. Hence, the present writ petition.

3. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents submitted that the petitioner is an habitual offender indulging in rowdy activities. Hence, History Sheeted Rowdy Book was opened at the third and fourth respondents police station as against the petitioner and it is being extended regularly as per the Police Standing Order. Therefore, he prays to dismiss the writ petition.

4. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

5. The issue involved in this writ petition has already been dealt with by 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



W.P.(MD)No.2511 of 2025

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



W.P.(MD)No.2511 of 2025

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



W.P.(MD)No.2511 of 2025

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



W.P.(MD)No.2511 of 2025

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



W.P.(MD)No.2511 of 2025

*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 sheeter.*

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 sheeter, beyond the stipulated period."

6. In view of the above circular issued by the Director General of Police, Chennai, this Court is inclined to pass the following orders :-

(i) the respondents are directed to consider the petitioner's representation, dated 22.07.2024 and pass orders, on merits and in accordance with law, within a



W.P.(MD)No.2511 of 2025

period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy
of this Order.

7. With the above directions, the writ petition stands disposed of.

No costs.

29.01.2025

(5/5)

NCC : Yes / No

Index : Yes / No

Rmk

To

- 1.The Superintendent of Police,
O/o., The Superintendent of Police,
Karuvelanaickenpatti, Vadaveeranaickenpatti,
Theni DISTRICT.
- 2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
O/o., Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Uthampalayam, Theni District.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
Gudalur North Police Station,
Gudalur, Theni District.
Crime No.150 of 1991
- 4.The Sub Inspector of Police,
Kumuli Police Station,
Lower Camp, Theni District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.2511 of 2025

M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.

Rmk

5.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

W.P.(MD)No.2511 of 2025

29.01.2025
(5/5)