



WP CRL.(MD). No.1992 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 09/04/2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE L. VICTORIA GOWRI

WP CRL.(MD). No.1992 of 2026

A.Magesh

... Petitioner

Vs

1. The State Rep by Its,
Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Lord Annai Road, Punnai Nagar,
Nesamani Nagar, Nagercoil Taluk,
Kanniyakumari District - 629 004.

2. The Inspector of Police,
Boothapandi Police Station,
Nagercoil Taluk,
Kanniyakumari District - 629 001.

... Respondents

PRAYER :-

To issue a Writ, Order or Direction in the Nature of Writ and in particularly Writ of Declaration declaring that to declare the History Sheet No. 05/2021 on the file of the 2nd respondent is as illegal and against the Police standing Order No. 746.

For Petitioner : Mr. P.Vijendran,
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)



WEB COPY



WP CRL.(MD). No.1992 of 2026

ORDER

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, for issuance of Writ of Declaration declaring that to declare the History Sheet No. 05/2021 on the file of the 2nd respondent is as illegal and against the Police standing Order No. 746.

2. The learned Counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has not involved in any of the criminal activities. He further submitted that the petitioner has served as the District Secretary of Viduthalai Chiruthaigal Katchi in Kanyakumari District. During that period, the second respondent police station opened a History Sheet against the petitioner in H.S.No.5/2001, without any objective assessment of habitual criminality. In the year 2003, two criminal cases were registered against the petitioner in Crime No.73 of 2003 and Crime No.74 of 2003 on the file of the Boothapandi Police Station and the same



WP CRL.(MD). No.1992 of 2026

were culminated in filing final report in S.C.No.201 and 202 of 2003. The petitioner was incarcerated from the year 2004 to 2018. In the year 2023, certain cases were registered against the petitioner at Ambattur Police Station (three cases) and Korattur Police Station(two cases), which were arose out of a civil dispute. Without considering the same, the second respondent is continuing H.S.No.5/2001 against the petitioner for nearly 25 years. Seeking removal of the same, this petition is filed.

3. 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. 66569/Crime 3(2)/2019 dated 24.04.2019, which reads as follows :-

“7. From the above judgments the following principles emerge insofar as history sheeters are concerned:



WEB COPY

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 up to 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



WEB COPY

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 up to 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 sheeteer beyond the period stipulated in the Police Standing Orders.

k. This Court has time and again brought the above



WP CRL.(MD). No.1992 of 2026

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 the period to continue a person as a history sheeter.”

4. 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.

5. In view of the above circular passed by the Director General of Police, Chennai, this Court directs the first respondent to consider the petitioner's representation dated 09.12.2025 and pass orders, on merits and in accordance



WP CRL.(MD). No.1992 of 2026

with law, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this Order in the light of the aforesaid circular extracted supra.

6. With the above directions, the writ petition stands disposed of. No costs.

09.04.2026

NCC : yes / no
Index : yes / no

pnn

To

1. The Deputy Superintendent of Police, Lord Annai Road, Punnai Nagar, Nesamani Nagar, Nagercoil Taluk, Kanniyakumari District - 629 004.

2. The Inspector of Police, Boothapandi Police Station, Nagercoil Taluk, Kanniyakumari District - 629 001.

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



WEB COPY



WP CRL.(MD). No.1992 of 2026

L. VICTORIA GOWRI,J

pnn

ORDER
IN
WP CRL.(MD) No.1992 of 2026

Date : 09/04/2026