

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.2605 OF 2013

Santosh Mohan Rajput ... Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra ... Respondent

Ms.Rohini Dandekar, Advocate appointed for the Petitioner
Mrs.U.V. Kejriwal, APP, for Respondent – State

CORAM: **SMT. V.K. TAHILRAMANI &
MRS.MRIDULA BHATKAR, JJ.**

DATE: **JUNE 21, 2016**

ORAL ORDER (Per Smt.V.K. Tahilramani, J.):

1. Heard both sides.
2. Rule. By consent, Rule is made returnable forthwith.
3. The petitioner has preferred an application for parole in the year 2013. According to the petitioner, the Jailor returned the application back to the petitioner as it was incorrect. The petitioner in this petition has raised a grievance that his application for parole was correct, however, it was not accepted by the jail authorities. As far as this aspect is concerned, it is seen that the petitioner has not given any details as to on what ground he is seeking parole nor has he annexed any certificates to show why he is seeking parole. Moreover, the jail chart of the petitioner is

produced, which is taken on record and marked 'X' for identification. It shows that every year, from the year 2012 till this year, he has been released on furlough. He was released on furlough in the year 2012 on 24.9.2012; in the year 2013, he was released on furlough on 7.11.2013; in the year 2014, he was released on furlough on 1.9.2014; in the year 2015, he was released on furlough on 5.6.2015 and this year, he has been released on furlough on 25.5.2016 and as of today, the petitioner is out on furlough. Looking to the fact that the petition is entirely vague and no material particulars have been given by the petitioner and the above facts, we are not inclined to grant the prayer of the petitioner.

4. Hence, Rule is discharged.

5. Office to communicate this order to the petitioner, who is in Nashik road Central Prison.

(MRIDULA BHATKAR, J.)

(V.K. TAHILRAMANI, J.)