



WEB COPY

WP No. 9415 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 02-04-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE DR JUSTICE G. JAYACHANDRAN

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SHAMIM AHMED

WP No. 9415 of 2017

AND

WMP NO. 10381 OF 2017

1. P.George Miller, Inspector of Police, T.1, Police Stn, 5A, Gandhi St, Razak Garden, Arumbakkam-106, (attached-Sembium Police Stn, Chennai City Police at the relevant point of time)
2. R.Damodaran, S/o.Ramakrishnan Sub Inspector of Police (Retd), 19, Baraka Road, Namalwarpettai, Ch-12, (attached - Thiru Vi Ka Police Stn, Ch City Police at relevant point of time)

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Tamil Nadu State Human Rights Commission, Rep. by its Secretary, 143, P.S.Kumarasamy Raja Salai, Greenways Road, Chennai-28.
2. Pannalal Bohra S/o.Babulal Bohra, 8, P.V.Koil Street, Royapuram, Chennai-18.
3. The Commissioner Of Police, Chennai. (r3 Suo Motu Impleaded Vide Orde Dated 06.10.2025 Made In Wp.9415/2017 By Mstrj, Rsvj)

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: This Writ Petition is filed to call for the records on the file of 1st respondent in SHRC Case No.1663/2006, dated 17.8.2016 and quash the same



as illegal and unconstitutional.

For Petitioner(s): M/s.V.Raghavachari and V.Srimathi

For Respondent(s): M/s.V.Ravi, SGP-R1
M/s.H.Rajasekar, R2
R3-No Appearance

Order

(Order of the Court was made by Dr.G.Jayachandran J.)

1. This Writ Petition is filed, challenging the recommendation of the Tamil Nadu State Human Rights Commission, holding that the 2nd Respondent herein, had been illegally detained for three days in connection with a matrimonial dispute and he had been forcibly made to sign a compromise note and to part away about 417 grams of gold.
2. The complaint to the Tamil Nadu State Human Rights Commission was laid by the 2nd Respondent, making the above allegations and further placed on record to show that only after filing of the Habeas Corpus Petition before the High Court in HCP.No. 154 of 2026, the Thiru.Vi.Ka.Nagar Police Station had registered a case against him in Cr.No.248 of 2006, antedating the date of occurrence. The Tamil Nadu State Human Rights Commission, on verifying the records in the light of the complaint, had found that the 2nd Respondent had been detained in three different Stations between 07.02.2006 and 09.02.2006 and on filing of the Habeas Corpus Petition, the First Information Report in Cr.No.248 of 2006 was registered and forwarded to the



Magistrate on 10.02.2006, as if the occurrence took place on 06.02.2006 and the First Information Report was registered immediately.

3. The Tamil Nadu State Human Rights Commission, on appreciating the evidence placed before it, had passed the following recommendation:-

a. The Government of Tamil Nadu shall make a payment of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees one lakh only) to the Complainant Thiru Pannalal Bohra, Son of Babulal Bohra within four weeks from the date of receipt of this order towards compensation for violation of human rights of the complainant Thiru Pannalal Bohra committed by the respondents.

b. After making such payment, the Government of Tamil Nadu, may recover a sum of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty five thousand only) from the 1st Respondent Thiru Sekar, the then Asst. Commissioner of Police, Peravallur Range, Chennai City Police, on 06.02.2006, now retired as per Tamil Nadu Pension rules, a sum of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty five thousand only) from the 2nd Respondent Thiru Naganathan, the then Inspector of Police, Thiruvi Ka Nagar Police Station, Chennai City Police, on 06.02.2006, a sum of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees twenty five thousand only) from the 3rd Respondent Thiru George Miller, the then Sub Inspector of Police, Thiru Vi Ka Nagar Police Station, Chennai City Police, on 06.02.2006, a sum of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees twenty five thousand only) from the 4th Respondent Thiru Damodharan, the then Sub Inspector of Police, Thiru Vi Ka Nagar Police Station, Chennai City Police, on 06.02.2006 now retired as per Tamil Nadu Pension rules.”

4. The learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the Writ Petitioners would submit that the complaint had been made to the Tamil Nadu Human Rights Commission. The case of the 2nd Respondent is substantially different. In so far as the first Writ Petitioner is concerned, he was not even attached to Thiru.Vi.Ka. Nagar Police Station and, therefore, the complaint is a vexatious one.



5. Out of four Police Officials, who had been indicted by the Tamil Nadu State Human Rights Commission, two are before us, stating that they were not involved in the said illegal detention and not in charge of the Thiru.VI.Ka.Nagar Police Station.

6. On perusing the records, we also find that the presence of both the Writ Petitioners, at the time of securing the complainant from his house and forcibly extorting a compromise note and redemption of the jewels from the 2nd Respondent had been mentioned in the complaint as well as in the evidence. That apart, it is contended that the first Writ Petitioner, George Miller, was not attached to Thiru.Vi.Ka. Nagar Police Station, but, he was serving in the Sembiam Police Station, for which, the investigation report has been produced.

7. The investigation report is of a subsequent date, which only shows that the first Writ Petitioner, George Miller was attached to the Sembiam Police Station. All the more reason, when he was attached to Sembiam Police Station, he was present in Thiru.Vi.Ka. Nagar Police Satation and involved in the case. His involvement in Thiru.Vi.Ka. Nagar Police Station clearly shows that he had exceeded his jurisdiction, for the reasons best known to him.

8. Further, the Writ Petitioners were identified by the 2nd Respondent/ Complainant and their role in detaining the 2nd Respondent had been well spoken to by the Complainant and also supported by the records. The facts



that the illegal detention had been narrated in the Habeas Corpus Petition and pursuant to the filing the Habeas Corpus Petition, the Respondent had acted panically by registering the First Information Report with antedate and forwarded it to the Magistrate only on 10.02.2006, are evidence to prove the illegal detention and therefore, we find nothing in this Writ Petition.

9. For the above reasons, this Writ Petition is dismissed. There is no order as to costs. Consequently, the connected WMP is also dismissed.

10. It is reported by the learned Addition Solicitor General for the State that though the compensation recommended was paid to the victim, the same has yet to be recovered from the Writ Petitioners. In view of the dismissal of this Writ Petition, we find that there is no impediment for the State to recover the money from the Writ Petitioners.

(G.J.,J.) (S.S.A.,J.)
02-04-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

SRCM



WEB COPY

WP No. 9415 of 2



**DR.G.JAYACHANDRAN J.
AND
SHAMIM AHMED J.**

SRCM

**WP No. 9415 of 2017
AND
WMP NO. 10381 OF 2017**

02-04-2026