

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

229

Crl. Writ Petition No.1033 of 2015

Date of decision: August 31, 2015

Mahinder Singh

....Petitioner

versus

The State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment? Yes/No
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not? Yes/No
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest? Yes/No

Present: Mr. Vishal Nehra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Baljinder Singh Virk, DAG, Haryana.

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J.

The grievance of the petitioner in the present petition is that he made a request to the concerned authority to release him on parole for a period of six weeks on the ground that his three children are school going and he has to arrange funds to meet out the expenses for their studies.

Notice of motion was issued on 23.07.2015 and in response thereto, reply on behalf of State has been filed which is already on record.

Learned State counsel, on the basis of reply, submits that the address of the wife of the petitioner was mentioned wrongly as she was not found to be residing there. It has also been mentioned in the reply that there is no objection by the villagers and local police in this regard. Learned State

counsel also submits that the case of the petitioner is under consideration and the same shall be decided within a period of one month from today.

In view of the submissions made by learned State counsel and also the fact that the matter is under consideration and the same is likely to be decided within a period of one month, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to decide the matter in accordance with law within a period of four weeks from today.

Disposed of accordingly.

August 31, 2015
sonia g.

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE