

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

CRWP-536-2016

Date of decision :April 27, 2016

Rajesh @ Sarkari

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & another

..... Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.S. SARON
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GURMIT RAM**

1. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
2. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Present : Mr. Jitender Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

S.S. SARON, J.

The petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking extension of eight weeks' parole granted to petitioner from 31.3.2016 to 29.4.2016 on the ground that the father of the petitioner all of sudden fell seriously ill.

The petitioner has been convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment in case FIR No.781 dated 26.12.2006 registered at Police Station Civil Lines Rohtak for the offence under Sections 302/34 IPC. Aggrieved against his conviction and sentence, he has filed ***CRA-D-634-DB-2012*** which is pending in this Court. He has undergone actual

imprisonment of eight years, seven months and six days as per the custody certificate dated 30.03.2016 (Annexure P-1). At present, the petitioner is on parole for a period of 28 days from 31.03.2016 to 29.04.2016. He is to surrender in jail on 29.04.2016.

According to the petitioner his father namely Mukhtiar Singh has seizure-disorder and there is no one else to look after him. Therefore, it is prayed that his temporary release which is to expire on 29.04.2016 may be extended. In support of his case petitioner has placed on record medical certificate (Annexure P-2), which mentions that Mukhtiar has complained of 'seizure disorder'.

We have given our thoughtful consideration to the matter.

Perusal of the medical certificate (Annexure P-2) shows that Mukhtiar Singh has complained of and treated for seizure-disorder. Further writing as mentioned in the medical certificate (Annexure P-2) is not clear or legible. It is not shown whether Mukhtiar Singh, father of the petitioner, is an indoor patient or an outdoor patient. He does not seem to be an indoor patient, as there is no recommendation of his admission by the doctor treating him.

In the circumstances, we find no merit in the petition and accordingly dismiss the same.

(S.S. SARON)
JUDGE

(GURMIT RAM)
JUDGE

April 27, 2016
Gaurav Sorot