



W.P.Crl.No.452 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 16.06.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN**

W.P.Crl.No.452 of 2026

S.Rajkumar

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Superintendent of Police,
Cuddalore District,
Cuddalore.

2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Neyveli Sub Division,
Vadakuthu,
Cuddalore District - 607 303.

3.The Inspector of Police,
Oomangalam Police Station,
Cuddalore District - 607 804.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Neyveli Thermal Police Station,
Cuddalore District - 607 803.

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ petition(Crl.) filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents to remove the petitioner's name from the History Sheet (Rowdy List) maintaining by the 3rd respondent in H.S.No.289 of 2016 and subsequently by the 4th respondent in H.S.No.60 of 2025 by considering the petitioner's representation dated 21.01.2026 within a time frame fixed by this court.



WEB COPY



W.P.Crl.No.452 of 2026

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Senthamizhan

For Respondents : Mr.R.Ganesh Kumar,
Counsel for Government
of Tamil Nadu (Criminal Side)

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed praying for a direction to the respondents to remove the petitioner's name from the History Sheet (Rowdy List) maintaining by the 3rd respondent in H.S.No.289 of 2016 and subsequently by the 4th respondent in H.S.No.60 of 2025 by considering the petitioner's representation dated 21.01.2026 within a time frame fixed by this court.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the respondents registered a false case against the petitioner and his name was added as a history sheeter in HS.No.289 of 2016. The same was subsequently transferred to the file of the fourth respondent in HS.No.60 of 2025. In this regard, the petitioner submitted a representation before the respondents dated 21.01.2026 to remove his name from the history sheet. However, so far no action has been taken by the respondents.



W.P.Crl.No.452 of 2026

3. The learned Counsel for Government of Tamil Nadu (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondents submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender. Therefore, he prays to dismiss the writ petition.

4. Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials placed before this Court.

5. The issue involved in this writ petition has already been dealt with by the Madurai Bench of 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 Director General Of Police, Chennai issued a circular in Rc.No.133410/Crime4(3)/2018 dated 05.10.2018, which reads as follows :-

The Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court in its order dated 26.09.2018, in a batch of cases, in the reference second cited, while quashing the History Sheet maintained in certain Police Stations and which are challenged before the Hon'ble Court, has observed and directed as follows :-

"28..... there is a general pattern adopted trend by the Police to continue to retain the names of the persons in the history sheet showing them as rowdies



WEB COPY



W.P.Crl.No.452 of 2026

without any justifiable reasons. The Police did not realise that the purpose of opening a history sheet is to keep surveillance and check on hardened and habitual criminals in order to maintain peace and tranquility in the society.

29.As mentioned above, it also becomes the duty of the Police to keep reviewing the history sheet regularly to ensure that the persons, who are no longer required to be retained in the list are removed from the list, since it involves the dignity and public image of a person

30.Whenever representations are made by the persons whose names are found in the history sheet, it is the duty of the respondent Police to consider the same It will be of no use for the respondent Police to keep the representation pending even without considering them and driving the concerned persons to file appropriate petition before this Court. This Court only hopes that the Police learns a lesson at least after the passing of this order, to be more sensitive and serious in maintaining history sheet.

31..... The Police seems to be adopting the practice of registering FIRs against the persons under Sections 109 and 110 of CrPC, just to open the history sheet and to justify the continuance of the name of the persons in the history sheet. automatic opening of history sheet can be done only if the person has been convicted more than twice under Section 109 of CrPC and more



WEB COPY



W.P.Crl.No.452 of 2026

than once under Section 110 of CrPC. Therefore, mere registration of an FIR under Sections 109 and 110 of CrPC can never justify the action of the Police in continuing to retain the name of the person in the history sheet.

32.....

33.This Court wants to make it clear that in all future cases, where the retention of the name of a person in history sheet becomes a subject matter of challenge before this Court, if this Court finds that the name of the person has been retained without any justification and is in contravention with PSO Nos.746 to 748 and the guidelines given by this Court, compensation will be granted to the victims and the same will be directed to be recovered from the monthly salary of the Inspector of Police in whose station the history sheet is being maintained....."

2. Provisions contained in PSO 746 to 748 and the above orders of the Hon'ble High Court shall be followed scrupulously while maintaining the history sheets by the SHOs.

3. All Sub-Divisional Officers shall periodically review all History sheet files and Rowdy sheet files maintained in the Police Station under their jurisdiction.

4. IGPs in Zones, COPs in citites and the SPs in District shall sensitize all the Police personnel working under their jurisdiction in this regard and also review the



W.P.Crl.No.452 of 2026

cases periodically."

WEB COPY

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 petitioner is directed to submit a fresh representation before the respondents within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this Order.

(ii) On receipt of such representation, the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Neyveli Sub Division, Cuddalore is directed to consider the representation, in view of the direction issued by this Court and pass orders on merits within the period of twelve weeks from the date of the receipt of the representation.

7. With the above directions, the writ petition stands disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

16.06.2026

Index : Yes/No
Neutral citation : Yes/No
Speaking/non-speaking order
lok



WEB COPY



W.P.Crl.No.452 of 2026

To

- 1.The Superintendent of Police,
Cuddalore District,
Cuddalore.
- 2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Neyveli Sub Division,
Vadakuthu,
Cuddalore District - 607 303.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
Oomangalam Police Station,
Cuddalore District - 607 804.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
Neyveli Thermal Police Station,
Cuddalore District - 607 803.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai.



WEB COPY



W.P.Crl.No.452 of 2026

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN. J.

lok

W.P.Crl.No.452 of 2026

16.06.2026