

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.3345 OF 2014

Bajirao Ananda Patil

...Petitioner.

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

...Respondent

Ms Rohini Dandekar, Advocate appointed for the Petitioner.
Ms A.S. Pai, APP for the Respondent -State.

**CORAM: SMT. V.K. TAHILRAMANI &
SMT. ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, JJ**

DATED: 15th March, 2016

ORAL ORDER : [Per Smt. V.K. Tahilramani, J.]

Heard both the sides.

2. Rule. By consent rule is made returnable forthwith.
3. The Petitioner was released on parole on 15.7.2013. Thereafter he had filed one application dated 24.7.2013 and another dated 26.8.2013 for extension of parole period for sixty days. This application for extension of parole came to be rejected. Being aggrieved thereby, this Petition has been preferred.
4. The learned A.P.P. states that the Petitioner was convicted in Sessions Case No.47 of 1994. The Petitioner has

completed the period of punishment imposed on him in the said case and he has been released from prison.

5. In view of the above facts, the prayer of the Petitioner has become infructuous. Hence, rule is discharged. Petition is disposed of.

6. Fees be paid to the appointed Advocate as per Rules

(SMT. ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI,J.) (SMT. V.K. TAHILRAMANI,J.)