

## News

---

### The Madras High Court requests a district-by-district report on how Tamil Nadu's POCSO courts are operating



The State government and the High Court Registry have been instructed by the Madras High Court to provide comprehensive reports on the operation of Tamil Nadu courts handling cases under the **Protection of Children from Sexual Offenses Act, 2012 (POCSO Act)**.

Chief Justice Sushrut Arvind Dharmadhikari and Justice G Arul Murugan's Division Bench ordered the Registry to provide a detailed report on the total number of POCSO cases that are pending in each district of the State.

The Court also requested information on the number of courts in each district that now handle POCSO cases, the number of courts where presiding officers must be stationed, the number of new courts needed, and the infrastructure required for the prompt resolution of such matters.

The Court said on June 22 that "**Learned Counsel appearing for the High Court as well as the State are directed to file detailed Reports with regard to the functioning of the**

## **POCSO Courts in the State of Tamil Nadu giving all facts and figures."**

The next hearing on the issue is scheduled on July 7.

### **Justice Arul Murugan and Chief Justice SA Dharmadhikari**

The order was issued in response to a writ petition that a survivor of sexual assault submitted, requesting guidance on how to guarantee prompt trials in rape, sexual offense, and POCSO cases throughout Tamil Nadu.

A bench of Justices GR Swaminathan and V Lakshminarayanan had earlier issued urgent directives in the same matter on May 27, noting that the petitioner had been the victim of a horrible sexual crime purportedly committed by police officers.

The All Women Police Station in Tiruvannamalai filed the case for violations of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita. The case was brought before the Fast Track Mahila Court in Tiruvannamalai after the final report was submitted.

The petitioner informed the court that although the lawsuit was filed on December 11, 2025, the trial had not yet started.

Additionally, the accused police officers' dismissal from service on October 2, 2025, was reported to the court.

The previous Bench had noted, "We fail to understand why the learned trial Judge has not accelerated the inquiry till now."

Additionally, it had decided that the trial need not be postponed just because the accused's revision petition against the rejection of a discharge plea was pending.

The second accused filed a discharge petition, which the trial court was instructed to address within seven days.

The trial was instructed to be finished by July 31, 2026, by hearing the case on a daily basis, if the prosecution won and no interim order was obtained from a higher court within ten days.

**Advocates S Kamalakannan** and Jayasudha represented the petitioner.

With assistance from Additional Public Prosecutor Arun Anbumani, Advocate General Vijay Narayan represented the State.

The High Court Registry was represented by **Senior Advocate Vijay Narayan and Advocate B Vijay**.