



WEB COPY



W.P.CrI.No.200 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 03.02.2026

CORAM:

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

W.P.(CrI.)No.200 of 2026

P.Deivasigamani

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Deputy Commissioner of Police,
O/o. The Deputy Commissioner of Police,
Puliyanthope Division, Chennai.
2. The Assistant Commissioner of Police,
O/o. The Assistant Commissioner of Police,
Puliyanthope Range, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police,
P-5, M.K.B.Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition (Criminal) is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus or direction in the nature of writ, to direct the respondents to remove the petitioner's name in the History Sheet H.S.No.04 of 2010 maintained by the third respondent pursuant to the petitioner's representation dated 05.12.2025.

For Petitioner : Mr.Manimaran

For Respondents : Mr.K.M.D.Muhilan
Additional Public Prosecutor



ORDER

WEB COPY

The present Writ Petition (Criminal) has been filed seeking a direction to the respondents to remove the petitioner's name from the History Sheet, by considering his representation dated 05.12.2025.

2. Mr.K.M.D.Muhilan, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, takes notice on behalf of the respondents.

3. In view of the consent expressed by the learned counsel on either side, this Writ Petition (Criminal) is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage itself.

4. The submissions of the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner are as follows:-

4.1. The petitioner is engaged in real estate business. As on date, no cases are pending against him. The petitioner was acquitted in all the cases registered against him long ago

4.2. However, in order to harass the petitioner and restrict his movements, his name was included in the History Sheet in the year 2010, bearing H.S.No.4 of 2010, at the instance of the superior officers in



the Police Department. Despite there being no subsequent criminal activity on his part, the petitioner has been compelled to attend the police station routinely under the pretext of enquiry.

4.3. Therefore, the petitioner has not been able to lead a normal life and apprehends that the continuance of his name in the history sheet would adversely affect the career and future prospects of his children

4.4. Hence, the petitioner made a representation dated 05.12.2025 to the respondents, requesting to remove his name from the History Sheet. Since the said representation has not been considered till date, the present petition has been filed.

5. 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. Hence, he prayed for dismissal of the petition.

6. Having heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and upon perusal of the materials available on record, this Court is of the opinion that the issue involved in this Writ Petition has already been dealt



W.P.Crl.No.200 of 2026

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, the germane portion of 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 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 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*



WEB COPY



W.P.Crl.No.200 of 2026

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.”

7. In view of the above circular passed by the Director General of Police, Chennai, this Court directs the second respondent Police to consider the petitioner's representation dated 05.12.2025 and pass orders thereon, on merits and in accordance with law, within a period of **four weeks** from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

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

03.02.2026

ham

Neutral Citation: Yes/No



W.P.Crl.No.200 of 2026

To

WEB COPY

1. The Deputy Commissioner of Police,
O/o. The Deputy Commissioner of Police,
Puliyanthope Division, Chennai.
2. The Assistant Commissioner of Police,
O/o. The Assistant Commissioner of Police,
Puliyanthope Range, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police,
P-5, M.K.B.Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.
4. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



W.P.Crl.No.200 of 2026

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

ham

W.P.Crl.No.200 of 2026

03.02.2026