

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.4197 OF 2013

Anil Dayabhai Parmar ... Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra ... Respondent

Ms.Rohini Dandekar, Adv. Appointed for the Petitioner
Mrs.U.V. Kejriwal, APP, for Respondent State

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

DATE: **JULY 12, 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 preferred an application for parole on 25.4.2013 on the ground of illness of his mother. The said application came to be rejected by order dated 6.11.2013, hence, this petition.
4. The order of rejection clearly shows that there are other relatives in the family, who can take care of the mother. The police report dated 5.7.2013 shows that in the family, the father of the petitioner and the brother of the petitioner were available to take care of the mother of the petitioner. The application for parole was rejected on this ground and also

on the ground that when enquiry was made with Dr.Doshi from whom the mother of the petitioner was purportedly taking treatment, he stated that in the last six months, the mother of the petitioner had come to his clinic only on two occasions to take treatment. In this view of the matter, it was felt that the reason for seeking parole i.e., illness of mother was not genuine. Looking to the above facts, we are of the opinion that the order of rejection does not warrant any interference. Hence, rule is discharged.

5. Office to communicate this order to the petitioner who is in Paithan Open Prison.

6. Fees to be paid to the appointed advocate are quantified at Rs.2,500/-.

(MRIDULA BHATKAR, J.)

(V.K. TAHILRAMANI, J.)