

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.170 OF 2014

Pandurang Shridhas Vadane

...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

...Respondent

....

Mr. Sachin Chandan, Advocate appointed for the Petitioner.

Mrs. S.D. Shinde, A.P.P. for the Respondent -State.

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

DATE: 5th May, 2016.

ORAL ORDER [PER SMT. V.K. TAHILRAMANI, J.] :-

Rule. By consent rule is made returnable forthwith.

2. By order dated 1.6.2010 the application of the Petitioner for parole came to be granted. He was granted parole for a period of 30 days from 24.6.2010 to 23.7.2010. Thereafter the Petitioner preferred an application for extension of parole and he was granted extension of parole from 24.7.2010 to 22.8.2010. Thereafter the Petitioner preferred another application for extension of parole for a further period of 30 days. Grievance of the Petitioner is that his second application for extension of parole from 23.8.2010 to 21.9.2010 is not yet decided.

3. Second grievance of the petitioner is that in the year 2011 his application for parole came to be granted by order dated 23.11.2011 and he was granted parole for 30 days. He was released on parole from 11.12.2011 to 9.1.2012. Thereafter he preferred an application for extension of parole. That application was granted and his parole was extended from 10.1.2012 to 8.2.2012. Thereafter the petitioner preferred another application for extension of parole from 9.2.2012 for a period of 30 days. Grievance of the Petitioner is that the second application for extension of parole is not yet decided.

4. Thus, the grievance of the Petitioner is that when he was released on parole in the year 2011 and 2012 his second application for extension of parole made in both these years were not decided by the concerned authorities.

5. The learned APP has produced before us the orders of the divisional commissioner, Pune Division, Pune, which shows that the application of the Petitioner for second extension of parole made on 2.10.2014 was granted and parole period was extended from 23.8.2010 to 21.9.2010. As far as the second application of the petitioner for extension of parole from 9.2.2012 for 30 days is concerned, the same was granted and period of parole was

extended for thirty days from 9.2.2012. The orders showing that the second application of the petitioner on both the occasions was granted are taken on record and marked 'x' collectively for identification.

6. In view of the above, petition is infructuous, hence, rule is discharged.

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