

2025 LiveLaw (SC) 999

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL/CIVIL APPELLATE/ORIGINAL JURISDICTION**

J.K. MAHESHWARI; J., N.V. ANJARIA; J.

OCTOBER 13, 2025.

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CRL) NO(S). OF 2025 [Diary No. 58048/2025]

TAMILAGA VETTRI KAZHAGAM *versus* P.H. DINESH & ORS.

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (C) NO(S). OF 2025 [Diary No. 57588/2025]

PANNEERSELVAM PITCHAIMUTHU *versus* THE UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

WRIT PETITION (CRL) NO(S). 412 OF 2025

S PRABAKARAN *versus* THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU & ORS.

WRIT PETITION (CRL) NO(S). 413 OF 2025

SELVARAJ P *versus* THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU & ORS.

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CRL) NO(S). 16081 OF 2025

G S MANI *versus* GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU AND ORS.

Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973; Bhartiya Nayaya Sanhita, 2023 - Karur Stampede Incident - Transfer of Investigation to CBI - Formation of Supervisory Committee - Supreme Court takes cognizance of the Karur stampede incident that resulted in the death of 41 persons and injuries to over 100 people during a political rally organized by Tamilaga Vettri Kazhagam (TVK) - Noted that top police officials publicly defended the actions of subordinate officers, creating doubt about the investigation's impartiality in the minds of the general public - Observed a contradiction between the Madras High Court, Madurai Bench, which denied CBI investigation holding local police investigation was not flawed, and a Single Judge of the Main Seat, who *suo moto* directed the formation of a Special Investigation Team (SIT) - Held that Due to the political undertone, the gravity of the incident with wide ramifications, the need to restore public faith in the criminal justice system, and to ensure an impartial and fair investigation - Court directed the transfer of investigation to the CBI - The direction for the appointment of the SIT and the one-man enquiry commission set up by the Chief Minister were suspended - A three-member Supervisory Committee, headed by Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ajay Rastogi (Retd.), was constituted to monitor the CBI investigation. [*Relied on State of W.B. V. Committee for Protection of Democratic Rights 2010 3 SCC 517; Paras 33-35*]

Extraordinary Powers of Constitutional Courts - Direction for CBI Investigation - Reiterated that the extraordinary power under Articles 32 and 226 of the Constitution to direct a CBI investigation must be exercised sparingly, cautiously and in exceptional situations - Such an order is not to be passed as a matter of routine or merely because a party has levelled some allegations against the local police - Held that it must be necessary to provide credibility and instil confidence in investigations or where the incident may have national and international ramifications or where such an order may be necessary for doing complete justice and enforcing fundamental rights. [*Relied on State of W.B. v. Committee for Protection of Democratic Rights 2010 3 SCC 517; Paras 12-41*]

High Court Jurisdiction & Propriety - Writ Petition - Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for Rallies – Supreme Court expressed concern and sought an explanation from the Registrar (Judicial) of the Madras High Court as to how a Writ Petition (Criminal) was entertained for the relief of framing SOP/Guidelines for political

rallies, which affects the general public at large, and why such matters were not treated as Public Interest Litigation (PIL) and listed before a Division Bench - Noted the impropriety of a Single Judge entertaining a matter, the cause of action of which (Karur stampede) fell under the jurisdiction of the Madurai Bench, without the Chief Justice's order, especially when similar matters were pending before the Division Bench in Madurai.

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 03-10-2025 in WPCR No. 1000/2025 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Madras]

For Petitioner(s): Mr. Gopal Subramaniam, Sr. Adv. Mr. C. Aryama Sundaram, Sr. Adv. Mr. Neeraj Kishan Kaul, Sr. Adv. Mr. Atmaram Nadkarni, Sr. Adv. Mr. Siddharth Dave, Sr. Adv. Mr. Gopal Sankaranarayanan, Sr. Adv. Mr. Senthil Jagadeesan, Sr. Adv. Ms. Dixita Gohil, Adv. Mr. Pranjal Agarwal, Adv. Ms. Rupali Samuel, Adv. Ms. Gauri Subramaniam, Adv. SLP (Crl.) Diary No. 58048/2025 etc. Mr. Rishi Agrawala, Adv. Ms. Rukmini Bobde, Adv. Mr. Avishkar Singhvi, Adv. Mr. Shreeyash Lalit, Adv. Ms. Aakanksha Kaul, Adv. Mr. Ankur Saigal, Adv. Mr. Nishvaakk, Adv. Mr. Mahendran T., Adv. Mr. Anand Satyaselan, Adv. Mr. Yash S. Vijay, AOR Mr. Shikhar Aggarwal, Adv. Ms. Aditi Soni, Adv. Ms. Sukriti Bhatnagar, Adv. Mr. Shashwat Singh, Adv. Mr. Jayvardhan Singh, Adv. Mr. Raghav Kohli, Adv. Mr. Adnan Yousuf, Adv. Mr. Siddhant Juyal, Adv. Mr. Joel George, Adv. Mr. Ankit Malhotra, Adv. Ms. Deepti Arya, Adv. Mr. Toshiv Goyal, Adv. Mr. Varun Tyagi, Adv. Ms. Ira Mahajan, Adv. Mr. Dhanya S. Krishnan, Adv. Mr. Selvam P., Adv. Mr. Ganesh Kanna R, Adv. Mr. Mohan Parathasarathy, Adv. Mr. D.S. Naidu, Sr. Adv. Mr. Ravi Prakash, Sr. Adv. Mr. Yasharth Shukla, Adv. Mr. Tasha Yashin, Adv. Mr. Aman Malik , AOR Mr. V Raghavachari, Sr. Adv. Mr. Balaji Srinivasan, AOR Mr. Subornadeep Bhattacharjee, Adv. Ms. Harsha Tripathi, Adv. Mr. A G Vedavikas, Adv. Mr. Balaji Srinivasan, Adv. Mr. Aman Prasad, Adv. Ms. Suvarna Singh, Adv. Mr. A. Lakshminarayanan, AOR Mr. Vimal Pani, Adv. Mr. Sathya Priya S., Adv. Mr. Samarhar Singh, Adv. Mr. R. Sathish, AOR

For Respondent(s) : Mr. John Mathew, AOR Mr. Kapil Sibal, Sr. Adv. Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, Sr. Adv. Dr. Abhishek Manu Singhvi, Sr. Adv. Mr. P. Wilson, Sr. Adv. Mr. Hasan Mohamed Jinnah, Sr. Adv. Mr. J. Ravindran, Sr. Adv. Mr. Sabarish Subramanian, Adv. Ms. Misha Rohatgi, Adv. Mr. S. Santhosh, Adv. Mr. Vishnu Unnikrishnan, Adv. Ms. Jahnvi Taneja, Adv. Ms. Aashigaa Pravaagini, Adv. Ms. Reena T., Adv. Mr. Danish Saifi, Adv. Mr. K. S. Badhrinathan, Adv. Mr. Veshal Tyagi, Adv. Ms. Arpitha Anna Mathew, Adv. Ms. Samridhi Srivastava, Adv. Ms. Sivani KMS, Adv. Mr. Richardson Wilson, Adv. Mr. Apoorv Malhotra, Adv. Mr. Lokesh Krishna, Adv. Mr. Aditya Ojha, Adv. Mr. Saran Raghunadan, Adv. Mr. Aravind, Adv. Mr. Gouthani Bhaskar, Adv. Ms. Aparajita Jamwal, Adv.

ORDER

1. In the present set of matters, Special Leave Petition Diary No. 58048 of 2025 has been filed against the order of the learned Single Judge of the Madras High Court dated 3.10.2025 passed in Writ Petition Criminal No. 1000 of 2025, challenging the direction for formation of a Special Investigation Team (hereinafter referred to as “**SIT**”).

2. Special Leave Petition Diary No. 57588 of 2025 has been filed challenging the order dated 03.10.2025 in WP(MD) No. 27556 of 2025 passed by the Division Bench of the Madras High Court, Madurai Bench, whereby the batch of writ petitions filed by some publicspirited citizens seeking directions to transfer the investigation to the Central Bureau of Investigation (hereinafter “**CBI**”) were dismissed. Petitioner in this case is a father whose son died in the unfortunate incident and was not a party before the High Court, he has sought permission to file the instant special leave petition.

3. Special Leave Petition (Criminal) No. 16081 of 2025 has been filed against the judgment dated 03.10.2025 passed by the division bench of the Madras High Court, Madurai bench in WP(MD) No. 27571 of 2025, rejecting the prayer for transfer of investigation to the CBI. The petitioner in the said case was not a victim / relative of victim of the incident, but is a public-spirited citizen.

4. Writ Petition (Criminal) No. 412 of 2025 under Article 32 of the Constitution of India has been filed by the petitioner whose sister and her fiancé have died in the incident; while making several allegations, the petitioner has prayed for CBI investigation. The Writ

Petition (Criminal) No. 413 of 2025 under Article 32 of the Constitution of India has been filed by the petitioner whose wife has died in the incident, seeking similar prayer.

5. After perusal of the facts and circumstances of the case, we issue notice in all the five cases returnable in eight weeks.

6. Heard on the question of grant of interim relief.

7. All the above cases relate to an unfortunate incident of stampede / crowd crush which occurred on 27.09.2025 at about 7.30 P.M. in Velusampuram, Karur District, Tamil Nadu (hereinafter referred to as the "**Karur stampede**").

8. The **Karur stampede** resulted in loss of 41 innocent lives and causing injuries to more than 100 persons during a political rally organized at Velusampuram in Karur District, Tamil Nadu by the Tamilaga Vettri Kazhagam, a regional political party (hereinafter referred to as "**TVK**"). Purported permission to conduct the said rally as requested by the **TVK** was granted by the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Karur Town Sub-Division vide letter dated 26.09.2025. The **TVK** was headed by Thiru Vijay (a renowned Tamil actor) who was set to visit the locality for a public meeting. In order to attend the said rally and meeting, huge crowd gathered at the spot to see him.

9. In consequence, on the fateful day of the rally and meeting, **Karur stampede** took place. In the aftermath of the unfortunate incident, FIR No. 855/2025 was registered on 27.09.2025 in Police Station Karur Town under Sections 105, 110, 125B, 223 of the Bhartiya Nayaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as "**BNS**") read with Section 3 of the Tamil Nadu Public Property (Prevention of Damage and Loss) Act, 1992 (hereinafter referred to as "**TNPP Act**"). The investigation was initiated by the police, and immediately on the same date, i.e. 27.09.2025, by means of a 'press release' Hon'ble The Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu announced the formation of a onemember Enquiry Commission headed by a retired High Court Judge, Ms. Justice Aruna Jagadeeshan.

10. While the things stood as thus in motion, on 30.09.2025 Writ Petition (MD) Nos. 27556, 27563 and 27571 of 2025 were filed before the Madurai Bench of the Madras High Court. The prayers made in the respective Writ Petitions are quoted hereunder:

WP(MD) No. 27556/2025:

"A. To direct the 3 and 4 respondents to order the 8 respondent to conduct Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) enquiry to find the truth behind at least 39 people died in a stampede at a Tamil Nadu Karur District Tamilaga Vettri Kazhagam (TVK) party rally. More than 80 were injured on Saturday (September 27, 2025)

B. To pay Rs.50,00,000/- (Rupees Fifty Lakhs) as compensation to find the truth behind at least 39 people died in a stampede at a Tamil Nadu Karur District Tamilaga Vettri Kazhagam (TVK) Party rally. More than 80 were injured on Saturday (September 27, 2025)

C. To pay Rs. 10 lakh compensation to those injured in the stampede and undergoing treatment in hospitals (September, 27, 2025).

D. By considering the petitioner's representation dated 28.09.2025 and pass such furtheror other orders as this Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

WP(MD) No. 27563/2025:

To issue a Writ of mandamus, to direct the 1st respondent in appointing the 2nd respondent to investigate, enquire and punish in the Road Show meet held by the TamizhagaVetriKhazagam actor turned Politician Vijay at Velusampuram, Karur District on 26th September, 2025.

WP(MD) No. 27571/2025:

To issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the 1st to 5th Respondents to transfer the investigation in FIR in Crime No. 855 of 2025 registered at Karur Town Police Station concerning the stampede death of 41 persons in the public meeting of Actor Vijay at Karur on 27.09.2025 to 7th and 8th Respondents Central Bureau of Investigation CBI or a Special Investigation Team (SIT) headed by a retired/sitting Judges of the Honble Supreme Court of India.”

11. Writ Petition (MD) Nos. 27532, 27540, 27541 and 27554 of 2025 have also been filed on the same date, i.e. 30.09.2025 before the Madurai Bench of the Madras High Court. The prayers made in the respective Writ Petitions are quoted hereunder:

WP(MD) No. 27532/2025:

“To issue Writ of Mandamus, directing the 1st respondent to draft and implement necessary and appropriate safety protocols and Standard Operating Procedures for all public gatherings, rallies and meetings to be conducted by and political party or such other organisation, which would draw public crowd.

WP(MD) No. 27540/2025:

To issue a Writ of mandamus, directing the Respondents 1 to 4 to frame and notify appropriate rules, regulations, standard operating procedure (SOP's) for regulating political rallies, roadshows, conferences and other mass gatherings in Tamil Nadu by adopting the crowd management guidelines issued by the NDMA (National Disaster Management Authority), NIDM (National Institute for Disaster Management) and BPRD (Bureau for Police Research and Development), thereby mandating the imposition of stringent regulations which are legally enforceable on the organizers of such rally in order to ensure adequate safety and precautionary measures, with appropriate guidelines for the collection of safety deposits, indemnity bonds, enrolment of group insurance scheme from such organizers/political parties who intend to organize such rallies. The congregations to ensure compensation for victims who may suffer irreparable injury and loss of life in the event of any untoward incidents that may happen, by considering the petitioner's representation dated 29.09.2025 within a time limit that may be fixed by this Court.

WP(MD) No. 27541/2025:

To issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents 1 to 5 not to accord permission to 6th respondent party to conduct meeting within the Tirunelveli District, until the completion inquiry, based on the petitioner's representation dated 29.09.2025.

WP(MD) No. 27554/2025:

To issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the Respondent No.1 to 5 to frame Comprehensive Guidelines or Rules for Crowd control and Mass Gathering Management in Tamil Nadu and to pass such other or further orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of this case and thus render justice.”

12. From the above, it can be gathered that various writ petitions were filed before the Madurai Bench of the High Court of Madras because Karur town falls within the jurisdiction of the Madurai Bench as prayed in those cases, it was cognizant of the **Karur stampede**, the prayer for formulating the Standard Operating Procedure (hereinafter referred to as “**SOP**”) along with guidelines for political rallies, road shows, public meetings, etc. and also of the prayer seeking CBI investigation in the matter was also prayed.

13. During the course of hearing, it has been brought to the notice of this Court that earlier, WP CrI. No. 884 of 2025 was filed on 16.9.2025 before the Principal Bench of the Madras High Court by the **TVK** seeking the following relief:

“Directing the Respondent to forthwith instruct all subordinate police officials throughout the state of Tamil Nadu to consider and grant necessary permissions to the petitioner party for conducting political campaigns led by its party leader, Mr. Vijay Across the state of Tamil Nadu between

20.09.2025 to 20.12.2025 on the basis of the petitioners political party representation dated 09.09.2025 by the consideration of the Representation of the petitioner dated 15.09.2025 in a fair, uniform and non - discriminatory manner, within a time frame fixed by this Hon'ble Court and in accordance with law.”

14. Surprisingly, the learned Single Judge of the Madras High Court Main Seat, without advertent to the prayer made in the WP Crl. No. 884 of 2025, *vide* interim order dated 18.09.2025, directed that the State Government to come up with the guidelines with regards to collection of security deposit from the political parties which intend to have huge public meetings, gatherings or demonstrations. The Court *vide* subsequent order dated 24.09.2025 *suo moto* directed to join the Chief Secretary and the Home Secretary of Govt. of Tamil Nadu as parties. On the said date, the Court disapproved the affidavit dated 23.09.2025 filed by the State inter-alia stating that for preparing the guidelines for collection of security deposit, several departments were required to be kept on board which may take some time, however, it was stated that the Government is addressing the issue. The report regarding formulation of the guidelines was also sought for by the Court while posting the matter on 16.10.2025.

15. While the said petition was pending, the **Karur stampede** took place and one WP Crl. No. 1000 of 2025 was also filed on 30.09.2025 before the Main Seat of the Madras High Court seeking the following relief: -

“To issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to consider the representation dated 30.09.2025 submitted by the petitioner and consequently framed guidelines in the nature of SOP for the conducting of road show immediately and thus render justice.”

16. In the said case, limited relief sought was relating to formation of the SOP and to consider the representation of the petitioner. It is not out of place that factum of dismissal of Writ Petitions seeking investigation by the CBCID and for payment of compensation by the Division Bench of the Madras High Court, Madurai Bench was brought to the notice of the learned Single Judge by the learned Additional Advocate General as it appears from paragraph 3 of the impugned order. However, the Court in para 19 took cognizance of the order dated 03.10.2025 passed in WP (MD) No. 27532 of 2025 and batch with respect to an undertaking given by the State for not granting permission for rallies on State Highways/National Highways till formation of SOP. In consequence thereof the learned Single Judge disposed of the WP Crl. 1000/2025 in terms of the impugned order.

17. After perusal of pleadings and reliefs, learned Single Judge has *suo moto* decided to enlarge the scope of the writ petition, stating extraordinary circumstances require extraordinary measures, even in absence of pleadings and prayer for constitution of SIT. Learned Single Judge made some observations about the **Karur stampede**. In the writ petition, the **TVK** and its members were not made party and without joining the necessary parties and affording opportunity, the order impugned has been passed. In result, as per said order, the Court took *suo moto* cognizance and recorded the finding of non-satisfaction with respect to progress or independence of the investigation and directed for the formation of SIT consisting of the officers of the State. The judgement is completely silent about how learned Single Judge arrived at such a conclusion and what material was perused by the Court. The said order mainly refers the submissions made by the Ld. Additional Advocate General.

18. It is not out of place to observe that the orders passed in the various writ petitions except Writ Petition No. 884 of 2025 were dated 03.10.2025. The order of the Division Bench of the Madras High Court, Madurai Bench in WP (MD) No. 27532 of 2025 and batch, taking cognizance of the aforesaid order, made the observation that learned Single

Judge of the Madras High Court at Chennai is seized of the matter relating to the formation of SOP in WP Crl. No. 884 of 2025, therefore, refused to consider the prayer for formation of SOP. In our view, where the prayer to form SOP / Guidelines for public rallies affecting general public at large was being examined, however, such petition ought to be dealt with by the Division Bench, registering as public interest litigation in right earnest, and not to be dealt with by a Single Bench.

19. It is also strange that in the above two Writ Petition Criminal Nos. 884 and 1000 of 2025, learned Single Judges of the Main Seat of the Madras High Court entertained the writ petition for the prayers which were not made in the writ petitions, and expanded the scope without any foundation in pleadings. It is also not forthcoming as to what was the need to increase the multiplicity of proceedings with respect to the same cause, subject matter and seeking similar prayers. In both cases, the learned Single Judge proceeded to take *suo moto* cognizance of the issues beyond the prayer and formed the SIT in WP Crl. No. 1000 of 2025, further asking the formation of the guidelines / SOP.

20. Pertinently, the **Karur stampede** falls within the jurisdiction of the Madurai Bench where, writ petitions, seeking investigation by the CBI and also formation of SIT were filed and heard by a Division Bench on the same date. Such being the case, there was no occasion for the learned Single Judge of the Main Seat of the Madras High Court to entertain WP Crl. No. 1000 of 2025, without orders of the Chief Justice of the High Court in that regard. On a query being put, how WP Crl. No. 1000 of 2025 was filed, referring the **Karur stampede**, before the Main Seat of the Madras High Court, in reply it was submitted that WP Crl. No. 884 of 2025 for the formation of SOP/guidelines before the Main Seat was pending, therefore, the Main Seat may have entertained the aforementioned WP for the same relief. Be that as it may, the subsequent petition in WP Crl. No. 1000 of 2025 was filed for formation of the SOP / Guidelines for which a petition was already pending as stated before us. Therefore, learned Single Judge did not have any occasion to entertain the said writ petition and it ought to have dismissed the petition. But by taking *suo moto* cognizance even during pendency of writ petitions before the Madurai bench within whose jurisdiction the incident took place and also ignoring that Hon'ble the Chief Minister of the State has already constituted an Enquiry Commission comprising of a retired Judge of the High Court, how far the order of the learned Single Judge was correct in taking *suo moto* cognizance and creating a SIT, is an issue.

21. It is not understandable to us, particularly when in WP (MD) Nos. 27556, 27563 and 27571 of 2025 prayers were made for transfer of investigation to CBI and/or formation of SIT, and the Division Bench at Madurai was cognizant of the same and said that the investigation is at a nascent stage and no flaw in the police investigation has been brought. In stark contradiction, the learned Single Judge, while dealing with the matter, of constituting a SIT, *suo moto*, without referring any documents or assigning any reasons recorded dissatisfaction with the progress and independence of the investigation. Thus, from the above, it is clear that the Division Bench at Madurai denied the CBI investigation, holding that the investigation by the local police is not flawed, while the learned Single Judge at the Main Seat, dissatisfied with the police investigation, directed for constitution of SIT. Such recourse *prima facie* indicates the lack of sensitivity and propriety to deal with such a matter creating multiplicity of proceedings, for the reasons best known to the Hon'ble Judges.

22. It is to be noted that in Writ Petition (MD) Nos. 27532, 27540, 27541 and 27554 of 2025 prayer for safety protocols and SOP for all public gathering, rallies and meetings by the political party along with other ancillary issues were raised with specific prayers as

referred above, but those have been closed due to pendency of WP Crl. No. 884 of 2025 and in terms of the undertaking of the Additional Advocate General. It is true that those orders have not been assailed in the present batch of matters, but the fact remains that the prayer asking for SOP because of the **Karur stampede** was not entertained in those cases by the Division Bench merely because WP Crl. 884 of 2025 was pending, though it was not a public interest litigation and no foundation has been set out in the pleadings of the said case. In fact, the said issue is under consideration in terms of the order of the Court which has expanded the scope of the Writ Petition. In the opinion of this Court, dismissal of the said batch of Writ Petitions by the Division Bench in which specific pleadings were set out asking the relief of formation of SOP due to the pendency of WP Crl. 884 of 2025 cannot be appreciated to be in right earnest. At the same time, as per the allegations raised with respect to impartiality and independence of the investigation, *prima facie*, the prayer for CBI investigation has not been duly dealt with in right perspective after hearing learned counsel for the parties at length.

23. All the above observations are *prima facie* and are interim in nature and subject to filing of the counter affidavit by the Respondents.

24. The above is a matter of concern and it is required to be explained by the High Court that a writ petition praying for formation of SOP / Guidelines for the rallies of political parties and roadshows, how far it would fall within the jurisdiction of Writ Petition (Criminal). It shall also be explained that in WP Crl. No. 884 of 2025 which was filed for different relief but as per the orders of the High Court it was kept pending for formation of the SOP/guidelines, why the said matter was not treated as Public Interest Litigation (PIL) and whether it will be listed before the learned Single Judge or the Division Bench. An explanation in that regard be furnished by the Registrar (Judicial) of the High Court bringing this order in the knowledge of Hon'ble the Chief Justice of the High Court.

25. In addition to the nature of the orders passed by the High Court as discussed, the other side of the **Karur stampede** is the cruel fact of death of 41 people and injury caused to more than 100 people in the incident at Velusampuram within Karur district.

26. The fact remains that **TVK**, a regional political party headed by Thiru Vijay, a famous film actor, applied to the police authorities and sought permission to organize several public rallies and meetings all across the State. One such permission was granted by the police authorities on 26.09.2025. During the rally, the **Karur stampede** took place on 27.09.2025. As such, at one hand, the number of deaths and injuries caused, has stirred public sentiment and shook the conscience of people across the nation. On the other hand, it is the ruling dispensation who have control over the immense machinery of the State, against whom allegations have been brought on affidavit for not having discharged their functions properly. The allegations have been made by the relatives of victims and public-spirited persons seeking transfer of investigation into the matter to the CBI while in the Special Leave Petition filed by the **TVK** prayer is made to hold an investigation under supervision of any former Judge of this Court. In the two writ petitions, referring various documents and materials, CBI investigation has been prayed. On the first date of hearing and prior to filing the counter affidavit by Respondents, we must refrain from making any comments, therefore, those allegations are left for adjudication on merits at later stage.

27. As per the pleadings and allegations as alleged, primarily it appears that due to not taking due steps and inaction of the police personnel the **Karur stampede** took place, while on the other hand the State machinery has not accepted those allegations. The top officials of the Police Department have taken to press conferences to abjure the fault of the sub-ordinate officials and have taken a robust defense that their officers were prompt

in taking requisite action. In the said sequel, it cannot be denied that the permission was granted by the police for holding a political rally by the **TVK** on a connecting route to a National Highway while in January, 2025 permission sought by a different political party was refused.

28. It is said that even after granting such permission, necessary steps for handling the public gathering were not taken. It is urged before us that if investigation would be carried out by the police personnel whose top officials have already come out before the media, making a statement that their sub-ordinate officers have taken adequate steps and are not at fault, how far such an investigation would be fair. *Prima facie*, this fact in itself creates a doubt in the minds of the general public about the independence and impartiality of the investigation.

29. In the said situation, caught in the doldrums are the families of the deceased, injured victims and kith and kin of those who lost their lives in this tragedy. For them, the political tussle between the two sides is of little solace. All they are asking is for an unbiased, independent and impartial investigation in their pursuit of justice. They have knocked the doors of the High Court as well as of this Court along with the public – spirited persons, making a prayer for unbiased, uninfluenced investigation by a central agency.

30. Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the parties placed reliance on various judgments, however, at this stage, we are not referring all those and appreciating in detail. At the same time, it is required to be seen, when can investigation through CBI, as prayed, be directed by the High Court or by this Court. In this regard, we can profitably refer the judgment of this Court in the case of **State of W.B. vs. Committee for Protection of Democratic Rights (2010) 3 SCC 517** wherein para 70, this Court observed as thus:

70. Before parting with the case, we deem it necessary to emphasise that despite wide powers conferred by Articles 32 and 226 of the Constitution, while passing any order, the Courts must bear in mind certain self-imposed limitations on the exercise of these constitutional powers. The very plenitude of the power under the said articles requires great caution in its exercise. Insofar as the question of issuing a direction to CBI to conduct investigation in a case is concerned, although no inflexible guidelines can be laid down to decide whether or not such power should be exercised but time and again it has been reiterated that such an order is not to be passed as a matter of routine or merely because a party has levelled some allegations against the local police. This extraordinary power must be exercised sparingly, cautiously and in exceptional situations where it becomes necessary to provide credibility and instil confidence in investigations or where the incident may have national and international ramifications or where such an order may be necessary for doing complete justice and enforcing the fundamental rights. Otherwise CBI would be flooded with a large number of cases and with limited resources, may find it difficult to properly investigate even serious cases and in the process lose its credibility and purpose with unsatisfactory investigations.

31. After perusal it can safely be said that there are no inflexible guidelines to decide whether or not such power should be exercised. The CBI investigation ought not to be directed in a routine manner or where a party has levelled some allegations against local police. Such powers can be exercised cautiously in exceptional situation where it becomes necessary to provide credibility and instill confidence in investigation or where the incident may have national and international ramifications or where such an order may be necessary for doing complete justice and enforcing the fundamental rights. In the facts of this case, the incident of **Karur stampede** has definitely left an imprint in the minds of the citizens throughout the country, wherein 41 persons died in a stampede and more than 100 were injured, it has wide ramifications in respect of the life of the citizens and in this context enforcing the fundamental rights of the families who lost their kith and kin is of

utmost importance. Therefore, looking to the political undertone of the case and the fact that without having regard to the gravity of the incident, the comments which have been made before the media by the top officers of the Police Department, may create doubt in the minds of the citizenry on impartiality and fair investigation. The faith and trust of the general public on the process of investigation must be restored in the criminal justice system, and one way to instill such trust is by ensuring that the investigation in the present case is completely impartial, independent and unbiased.

32. Looking to the fact that the issue involved certainly has a bearing on the fundamental rights of the citizens and the incident which has shaken the national conscience, deserves fair and impartial investigation. As such, by way of interim measure, direction deserves to be issued to handover the investigation to the CBI which would lead to fair administration of justice. There cannot be any doubt that fair investigation is the right of a citizen. Therefore, in view of the foregoing, the following interim directions are issued:

- (i) The investigation with respect to FIR No. 855/2025 registered on 27.09.2025 in the Karur Town PS is hereby transferred to the CBI.
- (ii) The Director, CBI shall forthwith appoint a senior officer for taking over the investigation and appoint some other officers for assistance of the said officer.
- (iii) The Superintendent of Police and SHO of the Karur Town PS as well as the SIT set up pursuant to the order of the learned Single Judge and the Enquiry Commission set-up by Hon'ble the Chief Minister, shall immediately hand over the FIR and other relevant papers, evidence – digital or otherwise collected till now for further investigation to the officers of the CBI.
- (iv) In view of transferring the investigation to the CBI, the direction for appointment of SIT or one-man enquiry commission shall remain suspended.
- (v) State of Tamil Nadu is directed to extend full cooperation to the officers of the CBI in the investigation as directed and if necessary, shall provide requisite logistical support to them.

33. In the facts of the case and the prayer as made, in order to allay the concerns of all parties, in the pursuit of independence and impartiality of the investigation, we propose to set up a three-member Supervisory Committee (the “**Committee**”) headed by a former Judge of this Court. We have requested Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ajay Rastogi (Retd.) who has agreed to head the said Committee. We further request him to choose two Senior Indian Police Service (IPS) officers not below the rank of Inspector General of Police, who may be of Tamil Nadu cadre but shall not be a native of Tamil Nadu, as per the choice of the Hon'ble former Judge. The scope and mandate of the Committee so formed shall be as follows:

- (i) The Committee shall monitor the investigation transferred to the CBI and is at liberty to issue proper directions for the areas in which the investigation is required to be carried out;
- (ii) It shall monitor the investigation carried out by the CBI as directed;
- (iii) The Committee shall have the liberty to review the evidence collected by the CBI from time to time and supervise the investigation to ensure that it reaches its logical conclusion;

(iv) The Committee may undertake an inquiry into any matter ancillary / incidental to the **Karur stampede** which might be necessary to ensure fair, transparent and independent investigation into the matter as it deems fit.

(v) The Committee shall devise its own procedure as per the directions of the Hon'ble former Judge.

34. Additionally, it is made clear that Mr. Justice Ajay Rastogi (Retd.) may fix emoluments payable to him as well as any incidental expenses which might arise, including but not limited to perks / facilities, transportation, logistics, secretarial expenses, which shall be borne by the State of Tamil Nadu, making all necessary payments. The State of Tamil Nadu shall appoint a senior officer as the 'Nodal Officer' to facilitate the communication between the Committee, the CBI and the State.

35. In case an order of this Court is necessary at any stage for the smooth functioning of the Committee or the investigation by the CBI, liberty is granted to move an application in that regard before this Court.

36. A soft copy of this order, the record of proceedings and pleadings of these cases, be transmitted to Hon'ble Justice Ajay Rastogi (Retd.) and the Director, CBI through the office of the learned Solicitor General forthwith.

37. Considering the ramifications of the incident and its gravity, we request the Chairman of the Committee to immediately organize its first meeting after taking over of the charge of the investigation by the CBI.

38. The officers of the CBI are directed to submit monthly progress report of investigation to the Committee which may be placed for consideration before this Court as and when required. We further request that the investigation may be completed as expeditiously as possible within the statutory time frame.

39. The W.P. CrI. No. 884/2025 which is pending before the High Court on the issue of formation of SOP/guidelines for political rallies shall be assigned by the Chief Justice to the Division Bench for further hearing.

40. It is clarified that the interim order is passed on the *prima facie* opinion, subject to further orders after filing of the counter affidavits.