

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 28.12.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN

W.P.Nos.39893 & 39895 of 2024
and
W.M.P.No.43221 of 2024

W.P.No.39893 of 2024:

R.Varalakshmi

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The Government of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by the Chief Secretary to Government,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The Government of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by the Home Secretary/
Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
- 3.The Director General of Police,
Dr. Radhakrishnan Road,
Mylapore, Chennai – 4.
- 4.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai Corporation,
EVK Sampath Salai,

Veppery, Chennai – 7.

5.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Kotturpuram, Chennai – 85.

6.The Vice Chancellor,
Anna University,
Gandhi Mandapam Road,
Chennai.

7.The Registrar,
Anna University,
Gandhi Mandapam Road,
Guindy, Chennai – 25.

8.The Director General of Police,
Central Bureau of Investigation,
Lodhi Road, CGO Complex,
New Delhi – 110 003.

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents 1 to 5 to transfer of investigation of the case in Cr.No.3 of 2024 on the file of the 5th respondent to the file of 8th respondent for proper investigation and file final report in accordance with law.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Jayaprakash Narayanan
For Mr.S.Tamilselvan

For R1 & R2 : Mr.P.S.Raman
Advocate General
Assisted by Mr.Edwin Prabhakar
State Government Pleader

For R3 to R5 : Mr.P.Kumaresan
Additional Advocate General
Assisted by Mr.R.Muniapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor,
Mr.Babu Muthumeeran
Additional Public Prosecutor and
Mr.A.Damodaran
Additional Public Prosecutor

For R6 & R7 : Mr.J.Ravindran
Additional Advocate General
Assisted by Mr.U.Baranidaran

W.P.No.39895 of 2024:

Mr.A.Mohandoss

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by the Chief Secretary,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The Home Secretary,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
- 3.The Director General of Police / Head of Police Force,
Office of the Director General of Police,
Mylapore, Chennai – 600 004.
- 4.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai Corporation,
EVK Sampath Salai,
Vepery, Chennai – 600 007.
- 5.The Director-General, Central Bureau of Investigation,

Lodhi Road, CGO Complex,
New Delhi – 110 003.

6.The Joint Director,
Central Bureau of Investigation,
Shastri Bhavan, Haddows Road,
Chennai – 600 006.

7.The Inspector of Police,
J-4, All Women Police Station,
Kotturpuram Police Station,
Kotturpuram, Chennai – 85.

8.The Registrar,
Anna University,
Gandhi Mandapam Road,
Guindy, Chennai – 600 025.

9.Gnanasekaran

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents 1 to 3 to transfer/hand over the investigation pertaining to FIR in Crime No.3 of 2024 on the file of the 7th respondents 5 and 6 /Central Bureau of Investigation for investigation and further action, pursuant to the petitioner's representation dated 26.12.2024.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.S.Mani

For R1 & R2 : Mr.P.S.Raman
Advocate General
Assisted by Mr.Edwin Prabhakar
State Government Pleader

For R3, R4 & R7 : Mr.P.Kumaresan
Additional Advocate General
Assisted by Mr.R.Muniapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor,
Mr.Babu Muthumeeran
Additional Public Prosecutor and
Mr.A.Damodaran
Additional Public Prosecutor

For R8 : Mr.J.Ravindran
Additional Advocate General
Assisted by Mr.U.Baranidaran

COMMON ORDER

[Order of the Court is made by **S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.**]

Table of Contents

I. FACTS IN BRIEF:.....	6
II. HER RIGHT TO PRIVACY. HER RIGHT TO DIGNITY. HER RIGHT TO BODILY AUTONOMY:	10
III. LEAKING OF FIR IN PUBLIC DOMAIN:.....	18
IV.LAPSES ON THE PART OF ANNA UNIVERSITY:	24
V.CONCLUSION:.....	27

This Court is aware that the investigation into the criminal case is ongoing. But suddenly the FIR involved in the present case was leaked to the public domain, revealing the details of victim and the incident. Further, the Commissioner of Police, Chennai has also divulged the details of the investigation through a press conference, which has become the subject matter of debate. The investigation details ought not to have been disclosed in the public, while the investigation is ongoing, as this could hamper and obstruct the process. The leakage of FIR is a serious lapse in the investigation process and cannot be taken lightly. This gives high chances to deviate and destabilize the ongoing investigation. Hence, this Court is inclined to interfere and entertain the present Public Interest Litigations to meet the ends of justice.

2. Heard all the parties to the *lis* on hand.

I. FACTS IN BRIEF:

3. On the evening of December 23, 2024 within the premises of the reputed Anna University Campus at Guindy in the heart of Chennai City and nearby Raj Bhavan, a second year Engineering Student of Anna University

was allegedly sexually assaulted and raped by accused. The Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station, Kotturpuram, Chennai registered a case for the offences under Sections 63(a), 64(1), 75(i)(ii), 75(i)(iii) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023. One accused person namely Mr.Gnanasekaran was arrested, and the investigation is currently underway.

4. It is widely reported that the victim girl along with her friend were near an old building within the Anna University campus. The accused filmed the victim girl and her friend and threatened by stating that the footage will be sent to the Dean and her parents, if she failed to comply with his demands. The accused reportedly attacked the friend of the victim girl and proceeded to assault the victim girl. He threatened her with expulsion from the University by leaking the footage to the Dean or she could spend time with him and another man, who called him through phone. Under threat, the accused allegedly raped the victim girl and recorded a video of the act. Further, he took pictures of her college identity card and threatened her to oblige to his sexual demands in future. He is believed to have spoken to another person from his mobile phone. The girl stated in her complaint that the accused received a phone call from someone and he said to that person,

he would leave the girl after threatening her. The student/victim girl informed the incident to the Internal Complaints Committee of the College/University, who directed her to file a police complaint. Accordingly, a Police complaint was filed with All Women Police Station, Kotturpuram, Chennai. And an FIR was registered for the commission of offence of rape and sexual assault.

5. The Police nabbed one accused namely Mr.Gnanasekaran and other suspects are still remain at large. It was reported that accused was a history-sheeter and several criminal cases are pending against him, including similar sexual assault cases. The said accused person has been classified as a history-sheeter in criminal records of the Police. However, it is not made clear whether the local police station conducted any surveillance on him. It is reported that the accused has entered the Anna University Campus on multiple occasions. It is further reported that several such untoward incidents occurred inside Anna University campus during earlier occasions. Some of the incidents were known to the Professors, Students and Administrative staff within the Anna University Campus, but no complaint was registered.

6. Though the writ petitioner in her affidavit has stated that the

accused Mr.Gnanasekaran is an office bearer of ruling DMK party, we are not inclined to consider those allegation, in view of the fact that the investigation is in preliminary stage. Political colour do not matter to a crime of this nature.

7. The FIR copy was made public and revealed the details of the identity of the victim girl along with the residential address, mobile number etc. The said act of any person or paving way for such commission of offence by the police is an offence under Section 72 of BNS, 2023. We have perused the copy of the FIR and found it is not properly worded and the contents in the FIR failed to protect the dignity of the victim girl. The sexual assault of the female student of Anna University in the heart of the city at Chennai has caused widespread outrage among students, faculties and the general public. Protests have been organized both within and outside the University, demanding immediate action and accountability.

II. HER RIGHT TO PRIVACY. HER RIGHT TO DIGNITY. HER RIGHT TO BODILY AUTONOMY:

8. The society has from time immemorial ordained women to conduct themselves as per a set of standards formulated which subjugates women. Women have always been morally punished for the crimes against them. It is not a debate between who is more powerful; a Man or Woman. But what matters is that a life is a life. She is someone who has rights, freedoms and vision of her own. She should not be dictated by any society or institution to sacrifice her rights and freedoms to protect herself. It is the incumbent duty of State and society to protect women. This shall not be done by blaming her, shaming her and accusing her. She has all rights that is guaranteed to her by the Constitution. The Constitution does not distinguish between a man and a woman. The society should feel ashamed to shame its own woman. The perpetrators find it advantageous that victims are blamed.

9. It is high time that the society positions itself from the shoes of the woman. Do only men have wishes here? Why can't a woman wish to fall in love without societal judgements? Why can't a woman wish to walk by

herself alone at night without fear? Why can't a woman wish to talk to her male friends and colleagues freely without being judged? Why can't a woman wish to dress up the way she wants without being shamed?

10. It was never the fault of the woman, it has always been the society, which has dictated her life. She should rise above these societal stigma and judgements. Nobody in this free country has any right to dictate a woman as to how she should live her life. It is always Her Life. Her Body. Her Choice.

11. Men and society should work towards gaining trust of a woman and not shattering them by its action. Nobody has a right to touch a woman without her consent. That is the fundamental that must be taught to a Man. Instead blaming and shaming the woman affected is a degradation of integral standards in a progressive society.

12. These actions of victim shaming and blaming, kills the soul of a woman. No woman deserves this kind of treatment. Every man should be taught to respect a woman. Rather than teaching the woman as to how to behave, the society should learn its duty as to how to treat a woman with

respect and dignity. Societal stigma is paving ways for crimes against women. The perpetrators find shelter in victim blaming and shaming.

13. Right to privacy of the victim under Article 21 of the Constitution stands breached in the present case, due to FIR leak and hence, this Court is bound to consider for grant of compensation.

14. In the case of *Youth Bar Association of India vs. Union of India and Others*¹, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India made the following observations,

“12.

.....

(d) The copies of the FIRs, unless the offence is sensitive in nature, like sexual offences, offences pertaining to insurgency, terrorism and of that category, offences under POCSO Act and such other offences, should be uploaded on the police website, and if there is no such website, on the official website of the State Government, within twenty-four hours of the registration of the First Information Report so that the accused or any

1. W.P.Crl.No.68 of 2016

person connected with the same can download the FIR and file appropriate application before the Court as per law for redressal of his grievances. It may be clarified here that in case there is connectivity problems due to geographical location or there is some other unavoidable difficulty, the time can be extended up to forty-eight hours. The said 48 hours can be extended maximum up to 72 hours and it is only relatable to connectivity problems due to geographical location.

(e) The decision not to upload the copy of the FIR on the website shall not be taken by an officer below the rank of Deputy Superintendent of Police or any person holding equivalent post.
.....”

15. In the case of *Nipun Saxena and Another vs. Union of India and Others*², the Apex Court dealt with the similar issues and made the following observations:

“9. Sub-section (1) of Section 228-A, provides that any person who makes known the name and identity of a person who is an alleged victim of an offence falling under Sections 376,

2. (2019) 2 SCC 703

376-A, 376-AB, 376-B, 376-C, 376-D, 376-DA, 376-DB or 376-E commits a criminal offence and shall be punishable for a term which may extend to two years.

10. What is however, permitted under subsection (2) of Section 228-A IPC is making known the identity of the victim by printing or publication under certain circumstances described therein. Any person, who publishes any matter in relation to the proceedings before a court with respect to such an offence, without the permission of the court, commits an offence. The Explanation however provides that printing or publication of the judgment of the High Courts or the Supreme Court will not amount to any offence within the meaning of IPC.

11. Neither IPC nor CrPC define the phrase “identity of any person”. Section 228-A IPC clearly prohibits the printing or publishing “the name or any matter which may make known the identity of the person”. It is obvious that not only the publication of the name of the victim is prohibited but also the disclosure of any other matter which may make known the identity of such victim. We are clearly of the view that the phrase “matter

which may make known the identity of the person” does not solely mean that only the name of the victim should not be disclosed but it also means that the identity of the victim should not be discernible from any matter published in the media. The intention of the law-makers was that the victim of such offences should not be identifiable so that they do not face any hostile discrimination or harassment in the future.

12. A victim of rape will face hostile discrimination and social ostracisation in society. Such victim will find it difficult to get a job, will find it difficult to get married and will also find it difficult to get integrated in society like a normal human being. Our criminal jurisprudence does not provide for an adequate witness protection programme and, therefore, the need is much greater to protect the victim and hide her identity. In this regard, we may make reference to some ways and means where the identity is disclosed without naming the victim. In one case, which made the headlines recently, though the name of the victim was not given, it was stated that she had topped the State Board Examination and the name of the State was given. It would not require rocket science to

find out and establish her identity. In another instance, footage is shown on the electronic media where the face of the victim is blurred but the faces of her relatives, her neighbours, the name of the village, etc. is clearly visible. This also amounts to disclosing the identity of the victim. We, therefore, hold that no person can print or publish the name of the victim or disclose any facts which can lead to the victim being identified and which should make her identity known to the public at large.

13. Sub-section (2) of Section 228-A IPC makes an exception for police officials who may have to record the true identity of the victim in the police station or in the investigation file. We are not oblivious to the fact that in the first information report (for short “FIR”) the name of the victim will have to be disclosed. However, this should not be made public and especially not to the media. We are of the opinion that the police officers investigating such cases and offences should also as far as possible either use a pseudonym to describe the victim unless it is absolutely necessary to write down her identity. We make it clear that the copy of an FIR relating to the offence of rape against a women or offences against children falling within

the purview of Pocso shall not be put in the public domain to prevent the name and identity of the victim from being disclosed. The Sessions Judge/Magistrate/Special Court can for reasons to be recorded in writing and keeping in view the interest of the victim permit the copy of the FIR to be given to some person(s). Some examples of matters where her identity will have to be disclosed are when samples are taken from her body, when medical examination is conducted, when DNA profiling is done, when the date of birth of the victim has to be established by getting records from school, etc. However, in these cases also the police officers should move with circumspection and disclose as little of the identity of the victim as possible but enough to link the victim with the information sought. We make it clear that the authorities to which the name is disclosed when such samples are sent, are also duty-bound to keep the name and identity of the victim secret and not disclose it in any manner except in the report which should only be sent in a sealed cover to the investigating agency or the court. There can be no hard-and-fast rule in this behalf but the police should definitely ensure that the correspondence or

memos exchanged or issued wherein the name of the victim is disclosed are kept in a sealed cover and are not disclosed to the public at large. They should not be disclosed to the media and they shall also not be furnished to any person under the Right to Information Act, 2015. We direct that the police officials should keep all the documents in which the name of the victim is disclosed in a sealed cover and replace these documents by identical documents in which the name of the victim is removed in all records which may be scrutinised by a large number of people. The sealed cover can be filed in the court along with the report filed under Section 173 CrPC.

.....

.....

50.1. No person can print or publish in print, electronic, social media, etc. the name of the victim or even in a remote manner disclose any facts which can lead to the victim being identified and which should make her identity known to the public at large.”

III. LEAKING OF FIR IN PUBLIC DOMAIN:

16. It is unfortunate that, in the case on hand, the leaking of the FIR

has itself paved way for victim shaming. The details of the victim including her name, contact number, address, the details of the incident has been leaked and circulated in the public domain. The FIR leak has not only breached her right to privacy but also attacked her right to dignity. The victim and her family is now made to go through more mental agony and trauma at the very incident, which is unacceptable and strongly condemnable. Even construed as a mistake or technical error, it is essential to understand that errors should not find any place in such sensitive cases, especially in cases involving crimes against women and children. The dictum in *Nipun Saxena's* case cited supra explicitly dealt with these issues.

17. This major lapse of FIR leak will amplify fear and anxiety among victims of such heinous crimes. Victims will hesitate to come forward to report such crimes, if FIR with all details are leaked into the public domain. Further, the details of the victim being leaked can disrupt their social life and may also hamper the investigation process, as there is scope for victim harassment and intimidation. This will have a chilling effect and would embolden the offender to repeat the crime against women in the society. Moreover, it can sabotage the investigation. This ought to be viewed

seriously and an investigation into this is of utmost importance. Confidentiality of the victim's detail is paramount, as investigation into crimes of this nature requires a victim centred approach.

18. This Court whole heartedly appreciates the courage exhibited by the brave survivor in coming forward to report the crime. Unless victims come forward to report crimes, the perpetrators will continue with committing such crimes.

19. This Court feels that the victim student has been wronged by not being adequately protected within the premises of the University campus. The victim ought to be compensated and hence, the Anna University has to ensure that the victim can continue her studies uninterruptedly and the University shall waive all charges, including tuition fees, hostel fees, etc., enabling her to complete her studies. The University shall provide counselling to the victim girl and encourage her to pursue her studies and complete the course. All necessary assistance are to be provided to the victim girl and to her family members.

20. At the initial stage of investigation, the Commissioner of Police, Chennai gave a press interview to the media. The Commissioner of Police, Chennai disclosed that one accused person is involved in the crime. Further, he revealed that FIR was not leaked by the Police and the leakage of FIR was due to technical glitches while registering and uploading the FIR in CCTNS. The Commissioner of Police further revealed that the accused's cellphone was in flight mode and the reference to another person in the FIR as 'SIR' was made to threaten the victim girl. The vital informations regarding the scene of crime disclosed by the Commissioner of Police through a press interview to the media, undoubtedly would cause prejudice to further investigation and hamper the investigation. The Investigating Officer, subordinate to the Commissioner of Police, may not be in a position to conduct further investigation in a free and fair manner. Thus change of investigation from the subordinate officials of the Commissioner of Police, Chennai become inevitable.

21. The details of the FIR leaked in public showcases the deplorable language employed in the FIR paving way for victim blaming. Further, the Commissioner during press meet disclosed that the FIR will be drafted as

exactly given by the complainant and hence, it was recorded as stated by the victim. But the language employed in the FIR is shocking, as it is, more a case of victim blaming. Even at the time of receiving complaint, counselling must have been provided by the officials concerned, so as to understand the clear picture about the incident in order to eliminate the trauma already caused to the victim girl by the accused person. The complaint and the FIR could have been drafted in such a way as to protect the dignity of the victim. It is the duty of the Police official receiving the complaint to assist the victim by employing a language, which does not infringe her right to dignity. Rather using words/phrases, insinuating the woman's character and berating her dignity is uncalled for. This could have been avoided by appropriate choice of words without violating her right to dignity.

22. The Government in the present case is bound to examine the implication of Rule 6 of All India Service (Conduct Rules), 1968, which reads as under:

“6. Connection with press or radio—Previous sanction of the Government shall not be required when the member of the service, in the bonafide discharge of his duties or otherwise, publishes a

book or contributes to or participates in a public media. Provided that he shall observe the provisions of rules and at all times make it clear that the views expressed, are of his own and not those of the Government.

(2) No member of the service shall except with the previous sanction of the Government or any other authority empowered by it in this behalf, or except in the *bona fide* discharge of his duties-

(a) publish a book himself or through a publisher or contribute an article to a book or a compilation of article, or

(b) participate in a radio broadcast or contribute an article or write a letter to a newspaper or periodical,

either in his own name or anonymously or pseudonymously or in the name of any other person:

Provided that no such sanction shall be required-

(i) if such publication is through a publisher and is of a purely literary, artistic or scientific character, or

(ii) If such contribution, broadcast or writing is of a purely literary, artistic or scientific character.]”

23. This Court is of the considered opinion that the press conference invited by the Commissioner of Police, Chennai without obtaining prior permission from the Government does not fall under any of the exclusion clauses under the Rules. Therefore, the Government has to examine and initiate all appropriate actions against the Commissioner of Police, Chennai, if required, under the relevant law. The press conference called for by the Commissioner of Police, Chennai within two days after the incident and disclosing certain important facts in the public domain is highly unwarranted. Therefore, the Government has to take a call and initiate all appropriate actions.

IV.LAPSES ON THE PART OF ANNA UNIVERSITY:

24. Mr.J.Ravindran, the learned Additional Advocate General would submit that Anna University Administration has already appointed a

Committee to look into the lapses and to improve the same. We hope and expect that the Administration act proactively, in their capacity, as a custodian to protect the interest of the students studying and staying inside the campus. The UGC has already issued guidelines on safety of students on and off campuses of higher educational institution. The said guidelines are also to be taken into consideration by the Committee, while taking decision for improving the safety standards.

25. The Anna University Administration has paved way for security breaches. The fact that a large number of Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) cameras within the campus were not in working condition, inadequate positioning of guards inside the campus are the matter of serious concern. Further, free access of third parties inside the University campus are also security lapse at large, where large number of female students are studying, including those residing in the girls' hostel situated inside the campus. In a reputed University, where a large number of students are pursuing education, the security inside the campus ought to be given top priority. The Internal Complaints Committee must be strengthened by appointing individuals with proven expertise and efficiency.

26. The Learned Advocate General would submit that the media also should provide information to the public with all responsibility. We have no other opinion on that. While publishing news, the relevant laws applicable are to be taken into consideration by all concerned. The victim's name, phone number and other details, under no circumstances be revealed in the public domain.

27. This Court found several lapses both on the part of the Police Officials and the Anna University Administration and formed an opinion that the investigation must be handed over to the Special Investigation Team to be constituted by appointing Indian Police Service (IPS) Officers.

28. At this juncture, Mr.P.S.Raman, the learned Advocate General welcomed the decision of this Court spontaneously and has stated that the Government has given consent for appointment of Special Investigation Team. He suggested the following three officers to constitute the Special Investigation Team:

1. Dr.Bhukya Sneha Priya, I.P.S., Deputy Commissioner of Police,

Anna Nagar District.

2. Ms.Ayman Jamal, I.P.S., Deputy Commissioner of Police, Avadi.
3. Ms.S.Brinda, I.P.S., Deputy Commissioner of Police, Salem City.

V.CONCLUSION:

29. In view of the facts and circumstances, this Court is inclined to issue the following directions:

- (1) All Women Special Investigation Team comprising Dr.Bhukya Sneha Priya, I.P.S., Deputy Commissioner of Police, Anna Nagar District, Ms.Ayman Jamal, I.P.S., Deputy Commissioner of Police, Avadi and Ms.S.Brinda, I.P.S., Deputy Commissioner of Police, Salem City is constituted to take up the investigation in right earnest, and conclude the same by filing charge sheet in two criminal cases registered in Crime No.3 of 2024 on the file of All Women Police Station, Kotturpuram, Chennai and Crime No.107 of 2024 on the file of Chennai East Zone Cyber Crime Police Station. All Women Special Investigation Team shall not allow any offenders to go scot free irrespective of their official position and how so high they are in the society.
- (2) The Director General of Police is directed to provide all necessary assistances to the Special Investigation Team, enabling the team to conduct investigation, file charge sheet and proceed with the trial

before the Competent Court.

(3) The Director General of Police is directed to provide interim protection to the victim girl and to her family members.

(4) The Government of Tamil Nadu is directed to pay an interim compensation of Rs.25,00,000/- [Rupees Twenty Five Lakhs Only] to the victim girl immediately, for the lapses by the Police Department in paving way for leaking FIR and for the trauma undergone by the victim girl and by her family members. The interim compensation granted by this Court will not be a bar for the victim to claim further compensation under relevant law. The compensation to be paid by the State Government can be recovered from all officials, persons, who all are responsible and accountable for leaking of FIR and for commission of lapses, dereliction of duty or negligence etc.

(5) The Anna University Administration is directed to allow the victim girl to continue her education and complete the course without collecting any fees including tuition fees, hostel fees, exam fees, mess charges, etc.

(6) The Anna University Administration is directed to provide counselling to the victim girl enabling her to pursue her education successfully and with merits.

(7) The respondents 1 to 3 are directed to ensure protection of FIRs in such nature of sensitive cases by adopting full proof procedures as contemplated under statutes and as per guidelines issued by the Constitutional Courts.

(8) The respondents are directed to remove all the details and references to the name of the victim from all social media forum and electronic media forthwith.

(9) The respondents 1 and 2 are directed to conduct a departmental inquiry regarding leaking of FIR and initiate departmental disciplinary proceedings against the officials, who all are responsible and accountable for lapses, negligence and dereliction of duty under relevant service rules.

30. The status report submitted by the learned Advocate General before this Court in a closed cover is directed to be handed over to the Registrar (Judicial), High Court of Madras, who in turn shall keep the same in a safe custody till the disposal of the two criminal cases registered in connection with the present writ petitions.

31. With the above directions, both the Writ Petitions are disposed of. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

[S.M.S., J.] [V.L.N., J.]
28.12.2024

Index : Yes
Neutral Citation : Yes
Speaking order

GD/JENI

Note: Registry is directed to issue order copy on 28.12.2024.

To

- 1.The Chief Secretary to Government,
The Government of Tamil Nadu,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The Home Secretary/
Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
The Government of Tamil Nadu,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
- 3.The Director General of Police,
Dr. Radhakrishnan Road,
Mylapore, Chennai – 4.
- 4.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai Corporation,
EVK Sampath Salai,
Veppery, Chennai – 7.

- 5.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Kotturpuram, Chennai – 85.
- 6.The Vice Chancellor,
Anna University,
Gandhi Mandapam Road,
Chennai.
- 7.The Registrar,
Anna University,
Gandhi Mandapam Road,
Guindy, Chennai – 25.
- 8.The Director General of Police,
Central Bureau of Investigation,
Lodhi Road, CGO Complex,
New Delhi – 110 003.
- 9.The Joint Director,
Central Bureau of Investigation,
Shastri Bhavan, Haddows Road,
Chennai – 600 006.

W.P.Nos.39893 & 39895 of 2024

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
AND
V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

GD/JENI

W.P.Nos.39893 & 39895 of 2024

28.12.2024