

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

COCP No.2200 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision :19.1.2016

Harjinder Kaur @ Rano

....Petitioner

Versus

Varun Roozam and another

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER

Present: Mr. Akshay Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

.....

MAHESH GROVER.J.

The order, non-compliance of which has been alleged by the petitioner, mandated a consideration on the issue of grant of parole to her.

The respondents granted consideration by passing a speaking order and giving reasons that the case of the petitioner cannot be considered affirmatively in view of the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

Learned counsel for the petitioner with reference to the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court contends that there is no such restraint, rather the State Governments have been given liberty to decide such issues by giving certain guidelines. Apart from that, it is contended that the co-accused have been granted similar benefit.

After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner, I am of the view that no case under the Contempt of Courts Act has been made out since the petitioner would have a liberty to challenge the order passed by the respondents negating her case for parole even if the grounds taken up as a reason to do so are fallacious. The only mandate of the court was to grant a consideration which has since been done.

Consequently, the petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to avail herself of the remedies in law.

19.1.2016
dss

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE