

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.1126 OF 2016

Lalif Khan s/o. Jabbar Khan,
Age – Major, Occ. Nil (in jail),
r/o. Nashik Road Central Jail,
Nashi, Dist. Nashik ..Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra,
through Home Ministry,
Mantralaya, Mumbai and ors. ..Respondents

--

Mr.R.F.Khandelwal, Advocate for petitioner
(appointed)

Mr.D.R.Kale, APP for respondents

--

**CORAM : S.S. SHINDE AND
SANGITRAO S. PATIL, JJ.
DATE : OCTOBER 15, 2016**

PER COURT :

The learned A.P.P. appearing for the respondents tenders across the Bar an affidavit-in-reply on behalf of the respondents. The same is taken on record.

2. It appears that the petitioner's application for parole for a period of thirty days was allowed by the respondents/authorities and he

was released on parole on 27.03.2015. Thereafter, the petitioner applied for extension of the said leave for further thirty days. By the impugned order, the application of the petitioner for extension of parole was turned down by the respondents/authorities.

3. We have heard the learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned A.P.P. appearing for the respondents. Perused the pleadings in the petition. We do not see any reason to interfere in the impugned order passed on 30.05.2016 thereby rejecting the application of the petitioner for extension of the parole with effect from 27.04.2015 onwards. In the circumstances, it will be open for the petitioner to apply afresh for parole, if desired.

4. With these observations, without interfering in the impugned order, this Writ Petition stands disposed of.

5. Since Mr.Khandelwal, the learned Counsel is appointed as an amicus curiae to prosecute the cause of the petitioner, his fees be paid as per the schedule of fees maintained by the High Court Legal Services Sub-Committee, Aurangabad.

[SANGITRAO S. PATIL, J.]

[S.S. SHINDE, J.]

kbp