



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU**

**DATED THIS THE 22<sup>ND</sup> DAY OF JUNE, 2026**

**BEFORE**

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 16009 OF 2026 (GM-POLICE)**

**BETWEEN:**

SRI. RAVINDRA REDDY @ REDDYAPPA  
S/O SRIRAMA REDDY,  
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS,  
RESIDING AT GUNTHURUGADDE,  
CHIKKABALLAPUR,  
KARNATAKA 563146

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SUNIL KUMAR S.,ADVOCATE)

**AND:**

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA  
BY CHIKKABALLAPUR,  
REPRESENTED BY, STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR  
HIGH COURT BUILDING,  
BENGALURU 560 001
2. DIRECTOR GENERAL AND  
INSPECTOR GENERAL OF PRISONS  
NO. 04, SESHADRI ROAD,  
BENGALURU 560 009
3. SUPERINTENDENT,  
CENTRAL PRISON, PARAPPANA AGRAHARA,  
ELECTRONIC CITY,  
BENGALURU 560 100

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. C.H. DEVARAJ., GA)

Digitally signed  
by SHWETHA  
RAGHAVENDRA  
Location: HIGH  
COURT OF  
KARNATAKA



THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO ISSUE A APPROPRIATE WRIT, ORDER OR DIRECTION FOR QUASHING THE IMPUGNED ENDORSEMENT DATED 19/05/2026 AT ANNEXURE -A BEARING NO BCP/J3/1030/2026 AND CONSEQUENTLY DIRECT THE RESPONDENT NO. 03 TO RELEASE THE PETITIONER ON EMERGENCY PAROLE FOR A PERIOD OF 30 DAYS AND ETC.

THIS WRIT PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING IN 'B' GROUP, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

### **ORAL ORDER**

1. The petitioner - Ravindra Reddy @ Reddyappa (CTP No.11986) is before this Court seeking for the following reliefs:

*a) Issue a appropriate writ, order or direction for quashing the impugned endorsement dated 19.05.2026 at Annexure-A bearing No. BCP/J3/1030/2026 and consequently direct the respondent No.3 to release the petitioner on emergency Parole for period of 30 days.*

*b) Issue any other direction & order to the respondents as this Hon'ble Court deem fit under the facts and circumstances of the case in the interest of justice and equity.*

2. The detenu had been convicted in S.C.No.355/2018 for offence under Section 302 of IPC by the IX Additional District and Sessions Judge, Bengaluru Rural District, Bengaluru and sentenced on 03.03.2020 with the highest of the sentence being



imprisonment for life. The detenu has served a period of 7 years 6 months 16 days of imprisonment as on 12.05.2026 and his conduct in jail is said to be satisfactory. The petitioner having made an application for parole, the same came to be rejected on account of adverse report having received by the police.

3. The petitioner has made an application for grant of emergency parole on 07.05.2026 on account of the expiry of his mother. Rather strangely and much more sadly the respondent police sought for a report of police verification. The said verification report was received on 13.05.2026, resulting in rejection of the application for parole on 19.05.2026, after 12 days of the expiry of the mother.
4. Though admittedly the petitioner has been convicted for offence under Section 302 of the IPC, it is but required for the respondent police officials and the present authorities to consider the applications for parole where it requires to be so considered humanly. In the present case, the detenu's mother having expired, it was always available for the authorities to release the detenu on parole



accompanied by police escort albeit for a short period of 2 days or 3 days. The same has not been done.

5. Report having been called for was received on 13.05.2026 and rejection order was passed on 19.05.2026 making a mockery of an emergency parole on account of expiry of a near and dear one, in this case, the mother of the detenu.
6. This also is shocking since the detenu had earlier been granted general parole on one occasion and court parole on one occasion, totaling to 3 months 28 days. When a general parole and court parole could have been granted, at which point of time there was no complaint, the rejection of an emergency parole application due to the death of his mother is unacceptable.
7. The Director General of Police had appeared before this Court today through video conferencing. This is one of the cases which have been pointed out to the Director General of Police. He is once again requested to look into these kind of matters and take appropriate actions such that the basic human rights of even convicts are protected.



8. The counsel for the petitioner submits that though the detenu could not attend to the last rites of his mother, he would want to participate in other ceremonies. Hence, detenu may be granted 30 days' of emergency parole.
9. Taking into consideration the facts of the case, this Court passes the following:

**ORDER**

- i) The Writ Petition is ***allowed***.
- ii) Respondent-Superintendent, Central Prison, Bangalore, is directed to release the detenu - CTP No.11986 on parole for a period of 15 days commencing from 01.07.2026, subject to the following conditions:
  - a) The detenu-CTP No.11986 shall mark his attendance in the jurisdictional Police Station, weekly once throughout the period of his parole and it would be the responsibility of the jurisdictional Police to take them to gaol, in the event, the detenu would evade going back to the gaol, after the expiry of the period of parole.
  - b) Respondent No.1- State of Karnataka shall stipulate strict conditions as are usually



stipulated to ensure return of the detenu to the gaol and that he shall not commit any other offence during the period of parole.

- iii) The Registry is directed to communicate the order to the prison authority for its immediate execution.

**Sd/-**  
**(SURAJ GOVINDARAJ)**  
**JUDGE**

PRS  
List No.: 2 SI No.: 76