



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 28TH DAY OF APRIL, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

WRIT PETITION NO. 13636 OF 2026 (GM-POLICE)

BETWEEN:

KUM. NAVYA H. K.
D/O KANTHARAJU H ,
AGED 24 YEARS,
R/AT HOSAHALLI, SUNDAHALLI,
HASSAN, KARNATAKA - 573 135

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VIJAYA PRASSAD, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF HOME,
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE
PRISONS AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICES
NO. 9, SHESHADRI ROAD,
GANDHI NAGAR,
BENGALURU - 560 009.
3. THE CHIEF SUPERINTENDENT
CENTRAL PRISON MYSURU,
ASHOKA ROAD,
NEAR FONTAIN CIRCLE,

Digitally signed
by
SHARADAVANI
B
Location: High
Court of
Karnataka



MYSURU - 560 100.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. K.P. YOGANNA, AGA)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO DIRECTION IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS TO THE RESPONDENTS FOR EXTENSION OF PAROLE GRANTED BY THIS HONBLE COURT BY 30 DAYS TO THE CONVICT, SRI. KANTHARAJU S/O HANUMEGOWDA (CTP NO. 00989).

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

ORAL ORDER

Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for the State.

2. The material on record discloses that the convict, who had earlier secured general parole at the hands of this Court in W.P.No.35481/2025, has approached this Court through his daughter seeking extension of parole for a further period of thirty (30) days. The request is predicated on the ground that



the convict's wife is stated to be seriously ill and is advised to undergo surgery forthwith.

3. Per contra, learned Additional Government Advocate, placing reliance on Rule 191(3)(iv) of the Karnataka Prison Rules, 1974, would vehemently contend that once a convict has been enlarged on parole for a period of sixty (60) days, the statutory embargo operates, thereby disentitling the convict from seeking a further grant of parole within a period of six months from the date of his earlier release. It is therefore contended that the present request seeking extension of parole is clearly hit by the statutory restriction and cannot be entertained.

4. This Court has carefully examined the rival submissions and perused the material on record, more particularly the relevant provisions governing grant of parole. On a plain reading of Rule 191(3)(iv) of the Karnataka Prison Rules, 1974, this Court finds considerable force in the objection raised by the State. The rule engrafts a clear restriction on successive grant of parole within the stipulated period, and



therefore, the prayer for extension of general parole cannot be countenanced in the teeth of such statutory bar.

5. However, this Court cannot remain oblivious to the peculiar facts and humanitarian considerations emerging from the record. The medical documents placed on record indicate that the convict's wife is suffering from serious ailments. These medical opinions nevertheless underscore the fragile medical condition of the convict's wife and the necessity of familial support during such period of distress.

6. In that view of the matter, though this Court is not inclined to grant extension of general parole in view of the statutory interdiction, it is of the considered opinion that the ends of justice would be met by reserving liberty to the petitioner/convict to avail the remedy of seeking emergency parole in accordance with law. If such an application is made before the competent prison authorities, supported by requisite medical records, the same shall be considered on its own merits, bearing in mind the serious medical condition of the convict's wife and the emergent circumstances projected.



7. The competent authorities, while considering such request, shall not be influenced by the rejection of the present prayer for extension of general parole and shall independently assess the claim for emergency parole in the light of applicable rules and the medical exigencies demonstrated.

8. For the foregoing reasons, this Court proceeds to pass the following:

ORDER

(i) The writ petition, insofar as it seeks extension of general parole, stands rejected in view of the statutory bar contained in Rule 191(3)(iv) of the Karnataka Prison Rules, 1974;

(ii) Liberty is reserved to the petitioner/convict to submit an appropriate application before the competent prison authorities seeking grant of emergency parole on medical grounds, enclosing all relevant and updated medical records;



(iii) If such an application is filed, the concerned prison authorities shall consider and dispose of the same strictly in accordance with law, keeping in view the medical condition of the convict's wife, within an outer limit of one (1) week from the date of receipt of such application;

(iv) It is further clarified that consideration of such application shall be independent and uninfluenced by the observations made in this order insofar as rejection of extension of general parole is concerned.

With these observations and liberty, the writ petition stands ***disposed of.***

Sd/-
(SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM)
JUDGE