Anuradha
2016.09.07 12:32
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

NARINDER SINGH VS STATE OF PUNJAB & ANR

Present: Mr. Nandal Jindal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashish Sanghi, DAG, Punjab.

It is not disputed in the petition that petitioner has challenged the order denying the benefit of premature release to him.

As per the reply, premature release was not granted to the petitioner because he would not covered under Policy, 2013.

` Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that crime was committed in 2005 and as per the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court "***State of Haryana Vs. Jagdish 2010(3) JT 341"*** passed in the case had to be considered on the strength of the policy that was existing at the time of committing of offence.

Learned DAG is not in a position to place any contrary judgment.

In the circumstances, order dated 29.12.2015 is also set aside.

Respondents are directed to consider the representation and afresh in the light of the policy in operation at the time when crime was committed and pass a speaking order thereafter within one month from the date of the receipt of the certified copy of this order.

September 05, 2016 **(AJAY TEWARI)**
Anuradha **JUDGE**