WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 30-10-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE K. GOVINDARAJAN THILAKAVADI

WP Crl.(MD) No. 5918 of 2026

CNR:{HCMD011537392026}

Narayanan

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State of Tamilnadu, Rep by the
   Superintendent of Police,
   Thoothukudi District

2. The State of Tamilnadu, Rep.by the Deputy
   Superintendent of Police,
   Tiruchendur Sub Division, Thoothukudi District

3. The State of Tamilnadu, Rep.by the Inspector of
   Police,
   Aathoor Police Station,
   Thoothukudi District

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents to remove the petitioner’s name from History Sheet Opened in History Sheet No. 11/1997 on the file of the third respondent based on the representation dated 15.10.2026 within a stipulated time that may be fixed by this Court.

For Petitioner(s) :Mr S.Vishnuvardhan

For Respondent(s) :Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi
Additional Public Prosecutor

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

ORDER

This petition has been filed seeking for a direction to the respondents to consider the petitioner's representation dated 15.10.2026 seeking to remove his name from the history sheet No. 11 of 1997 on the file of the third respondents herein, within time stipulated by this Court.

2. The petitioner has sent a representation on 15.10.2026 to the respondents seeking to remove his name from the History Sheet No.11 of 1997. Since the same was not considered, this writ 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:*
>
> *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*

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

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

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

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 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

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

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

4. The above principles that have 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 terms of the above circular passed by the Director General of Police, Chennai, this Court directs the second respondent to consider the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

petitioner's representation dated 15.10.2026 and pass orders, on merits and in accordance with law, within a period of four (4) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

6. With the above directions, the writ petition stands disposed of.

30-10-2026

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

To
1. the Superintendent of Police
   Thoothukudi District

2. the Deputy Superintendent of Police
   Tiruchendur Sub Division, Thoothukudi District

3. the Inspector of Police
   Aathoor Police Station
   Thoothukudi District

4. The Additional Public Prosecutor
   Madurai Bench of Madras High Court
   Madurai

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

K.GOVINDARAJAN THILAKAVADI, J.

Rmk

WP Crl.(MD) No. 5918 of 2026

30-10-2026

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis