



WP(MD). No.699 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 12.09.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.VELMURUGAN
AND
THE HONOURABLE Mrs. JUSTICE L.VICTORIA GOWRI

WP CrI. (MD). No.699 of 2025

Nachiyar

... Petitioner

Vs

1. The Deputy Inspector General,
Of Prison, O/o. the Deputy Inspector
General of Prison and Correctional Services,
Madurai Range, Madurai Central Prison Campus,
New Jail Road,
Madurai

2. The Superintendent of Prison,,
O/o. the Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Madurai..

3. The Superintendent of Police,
O/o. the Superintendent of Police,
Tirunelveli..

... Respondents

PRAYER :-Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records pertaining to the impugned order in No. 630/Vu.Tha.2/2025 dated 16.06.2025 issued by the respondent No. 1 and quash the same as illegal

1/5



WP(MD). No.699 of 2025

and further direct the respondents No.1 and 2 to grant the ordinary leave to the period of 30 days without escort to the petitioner's son in law namely, Arumugam S/o.Sudalaikannu (CP No.1302) by considering the petitioner's representation dated 05.06.2025.

For Petitioner : Mr.SMA.Jinnah
For Respondents : Mr.B.Nambiselvan
Addl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by P.VELMURUGAN,J.)

The writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned order in No. 630/Vu.Tha.2/2025 dated 16.06.2025 issued by the respondent No. 1 and direct the respondents Nos.1 and 2 to grant ordinary leave for 30 days without escort to the petitioner's son-in-law namely, Arumugam S/o.Sudalaikannu (CP No.1302) by considering the petitioner's representation dated 05.06.2025.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner's son-in-law is a convict and he was sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for ten years. He would further submit that the petitioner has applied leave for emergency leave for treatment to the



WP(MD). No.699 of 2025

convict's wife. However, the learned counsel would submit that the said representation was rejected. Therefore, the learned counsel would submit that permission may be granted to the convict for emergency leave.

3. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents, on the other hand, would submit that apart from the present case against the petitioner's son-in-law, there are 34 more cases are pending against him, in which, some of the cases ended in acquittal, however, there are seven more cases are still pending trial and the petitioner's son-in-law is a history sheeter. The learned counsel would submit that considering the previous antecedents, the request of the petitioner has been rejected.

4. We have heard the rival submissions and also perused the materials available on record.

5. Considering the fact that the petitioner's son-in-law is a history sheeted rowdy and there are seven more cases are pending against him,



WP(MD). No.699 of 2025

we are not inclined to interfere with the order of rejection passed by the
1st respondent. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

[P.V.,J]

[L.V.G.,J]

12.09.2025

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes/No
RR

To

1. The Deputy Inspector General of Prison,
O/o. the Deputy Inspector General of Prison and Correctional Services,
Madurai Range, Madurai Central Prison Campus,
New Jail Road,
Madurai

2. The Superintendent of Prison,,
O/o. the Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Madurai..

3. The Superintendent of Police,
O/o. the Superintendent of Police,
Tirunelveli..

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



WEB COPY



WP(MD). No.699 of 2025

P.VELMURUGAN, J.
AND
L.VICTORIA GOWRI, J.

RR

ORDER
IN
WP CRL.(MD) No.699 of 2025

Date : 12.09.2025