

CNR No: PHHC011368502026
2026:PHHC: 114740-DB



CRWP-9922-2026

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-9922-2026
Decided on: 18.08.2026

Pankaj Kumar @ Pinku

Versus

....Petitioner

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI

Present: Mr. Sanjeev Kadian, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
187	14.11.2015	Mohana, District Sonipat	148 IPC/181(3) BNS, 149 IPC/190 BNS, 302 IPC/103(1) BNS, 307 IPC/109 BNS

1. Seeking quashing of impugned order dated 10.08.2026 (Annexure P-4) vide which petitioner’s application for emergency parole was rejected, the petitioner who has been convicted in the FIR captioned above, has come up before this Court by filing the present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.
2. Petitioner’s counsel submits that petitioner has filed an appeal against conviction before this Court bearing number CRA-D-1517-2025, which is pending admit before this Court.
3. Petitioner’s counsel submits that petitioner was granted parole by the Jail Authority from 16.07.2026 to 31.07.2026 due to death of his father. He further submits that the petitioner applied for extension of parole to attend Chhamaahi ceremony of his father which is scheduled for 24.08.2026. The petitioner also approached this Court by filing CRWP-9171-2026 and this Court vide order dated 03.08.2026, gave directions to decide the representation within 15 days. Thereafter respondent No.3 vide its impugned order dated 11.08.2026, rejected the claim of the



CRWP-9922-2026 2
petitioner by stating that due to less custody of one year, petitioner is not eligible for any kind of regular parole or furlough.

4. Petitioner’s grievance is that parole was wrongly rejected. However perusal of the order dated 10.08.2026 (P-4) does not refer to wrong rejection but the reason was that he was not entitled to parole because he had not completed custody of 01 year after conviction. In the said order, it is explicitly mentioned that petitioner has not completed 01 year imprisonment as per sub Section (3) of Section 3 the Haryana Good Conduct Prisoners (Temporary Release) Act 2022, which reads as follows:-

“3(3) “Convicted prisoner who has not completed one year of sentence after conviction shall not be eligible for regular parole:

Provided that the restriction shall not be imposed on old aged convicted prisoner of seventy years or above in case of male and sixty five years or above in case of female;”

5. Given above, this Court found no illegality in the order dated 10.08.2026. Consequently, the present petition is dismissed. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

(RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI)
JUDGE

18.08.2026
Anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable?	No