



W.P.CrL.(MD) No.286 of 2026

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 21/01/2026

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN
AND
THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R. POORNIMA**

W.P.CrL.(MD) No.286 of 2026

Dinesh @ Dineshkumar

... Petitioner

-VS-

1.The Deputy Inspector General of
Prisons and Correctional Services,
Trichy Range, Race Course Road,
Trichy-620 023.

2.The Superintendent of Prisons,
Central Prison,
Trichy-620 020.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
O/o.The Superintendent of Police,
Pudukkottai District.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Keeranur Police Station,
Pudukkottai District.

... Respondents



W.P.CrI.(MD) No.286 of 2026

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records relating to the impugned order passed by the first respondent vide proceedings in No.RO.TRY/657/2025-G1, dated 22.12.2025 and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the first respondent to grant 21 days Ordinary Leave without police escort to the petitioner namely Dinesh @ Dineshkumar, S/o.Theethaiya, aged about 22 years, Life Convict Prisoner, PID No.397372 confined at Central Prison, Trichy.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.A.S.Prabhu

For R1 to R4 : Mr.T.Senthil Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.]

This writ petition has been filed challenging the order passed by the first respondent, dated 22.12.2025, thereby, rejecting the request made by the petitioner seeking 21 days ordinary leave without police escort.

2. The petitioner is convicted for the offence punishable under Section 6(1) of the POCSO Act and sentenced him to undergo life imprisonment in



W.P.CrI.(MD) No.286 of 2026

Spl.S.C.No.20 of 2022, on the file of the Mahila Sessions Judge, Pudukkottai.

The petitioner did not file any appeal and the judgment passed by the trial Court is attained finality. While being so, the petitioner applied for 21 days ordinary leave. However, it was rejected by the first respondent on the ground that the petitioner did not complete three years of imprisonment and as such, Rule 22 of the Tamil Nadu Suspension of Sentence Rule, 1982 does not permit to grant ordinary leave to the petitioner without completion of three years of imprisonment.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that though the petitioner submitted an application on 04.08.2025 seeking ordinary leave, it was rejected only on 22.12.2025. The first respondent had taken the date as 30.09.2025 and calculated as if, the petitioner did not complete three years of imprisonment and rejected the request of the petitioner.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents would submit that the petitioner submitted a representation on 04.08.2025 and



W.P.CrI.(MD) No.286 of 2026

thereafter, the first respondent received the reports from the Probation Officer and verified the antecedents of the petitioner on 30.09.2025. Therefore, the first respondent had taken the cut-off dated as 30.09.2025. As on date, the petitioner did not complete three years of imprisonment and hence, the first respondent rejected the request made by the petitioner.

5. On perusal of the documents annexed along with writ petition revealed that after receipt of the representation from the petitioner, reports were called for from the Probation Officer. The Probation Officer submitted a report stating that the convict conduct is good and the reasons stated seeking ordinary leave is genuine one. Therefore, the Probation Officer recommended the name of the petitioner for granting ordinary leave. The first respondent has passed an order only on 22.12.2025 without application of mind as if the petitioner did not complete three year of imprisonment and he is not entitled for ordinary leave. As on the date of order impugned in the writ petition dated 22.12.2025, the petitioner had verymuch undergone over the period of three years of imprisonment. Therefore, the petitioner is entitled for ordinary leave as per the prison rules.



W.P.CrI.(MD) No.286 of 2026

WEB COPY

6. Taking into consideration the request of the petitioner, this Court is inclined to direct the first respondent to grant 21 days ordinary leave to the petitioner without escort.

7. In the result,

- (i) The writ petition is allowed.
- (ii) The impugned order dated 22.12.2025 passed by the first respondent, is set aside.
- (iii) The convict prisoner namely, Dinesh @ Dineshkumar, S/o.Theethaiya (P.I.D.No.397372), is granted ordinary leave for 21 days, without escort.
- (iv) The petitioner shall produce all necessary documents, along with a copy of this order, before the jail authorities.
- (v) During the leave period, the convict prisoner shall report before the fourth respondent police daily



WEB COPY



W.P.CrI.(MD) No.286 of 2026

Evening at 05.30 p.m.,

(vi) The convict prisoner shall either execute a bond or deposit a sum of Rs.500/- before the prison authority along with one surety each for a like sum.

(vii) During the leave period, the convict prisoner shall abide by all the conditions prescribed in the jail manual.

[G.K.I., J.] [R.P., J.]

21/01/2026

NCC : Yes / No

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes / No

am



W.P.CrI.(MD) No.286 of 2026

WEB COPY

To:

- 1.The Deputy Inspector General of
Prisons and Correctional Services,
Trichy Range, Race Course Road,
Trichy-620 023.
- 2.The Superintendent of Prisons,
Central Prison,
Trichy-620 020.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
O/o.The Superintendent of Police,
Pudukkottai District.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
Keeranur Police Station,
Pudukkottai District.
5. The Additional Public Prosecutor
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court
Madurai.



WEB COPY



W.P.Crl.(MD) No.286 of 2026

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.
and
R. POORNIMA, J.

am

W.P.Crl.(MD) No.286 of 2026

21/01/2026