

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.4465 OF 2014

Khannasingh Ajitsingh Kalyani

...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

...Respondent

Mr. Yashpal Thakur for the Petitioner.

Mr. A.S. Shitole, 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 sides. Rule. By consent rule is made returnable forthwith.

2. The Petitioner had preferred an application for parole. Said application came to be rejected. The appeal preferred by the Petitioner against the said order of rejection came to be dismissed. Hence, this petition.

3. The application for parole came to be rejected mainly on the ground that when on earlier occasion the Petitioner was released from prison on parole / furlough he did not return back to the prison on time and during the period that he was released

on parole/furlough, the Petitioner committed four offences. Moreover, it is seen that parole is meant sought on the ground of illness of the wife of the Petitioner. Wife of the Petitioner alongwith her children is residing with her brother. The wife of the Petitioner has five other brothers, who are residing next door. Thus, brothers of the wife are there to take care of the wife of the Petitioner.

4. Looking all the above facts, we are of the opinion that no interference is called for in the order of rejection. Hence, rule is discharged.

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

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