

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPCR No. 161 of 2017

- Chatursingh S/o Shri Kaliram, Aged About 45 Years R/o. Village Sarangpur, P. S. Mungeli, Distt. Mungeli (Chhattisgarh) Through : Himesh Mohle, S/o Shri Chatursingh, Aged About 23 Years, R/o. Village Sarangpur, P S Mungeli, Distt. Mungeli (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through : Its, Principal Secretary, Department Of Home (Jail) Mahanadi Bhavan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. The Jail And Correctional Services Chhattisgarh, The Director General Prisons, Jail Road, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. The Jail Superintendent, Central Jail Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)
4. The District Magistrate Mungeli District Mungeli (Chhattisgarh)
5. The Superintendent Of Police, Mungeli District Mungeli (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Sunil Pillai and Shri Sunil Verma, Advocate.
For State/Respondents	:	Shri Ashish Shukla, Govt. Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant

Order On Board

17/07/2017

Heard.

1. Petition under Article 226 of Constitution of India has been brought by the petitioner with a prayer to exercise supervisory jurisdiction and quash the impugned order dated 03.02.2016 passed by the District Magistrate (respondent No.4).
2. Petitioner stands convicted under Section 302/149 of Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC') and sentenced to undergo life imprisonment with fine of Rs.1000/- and also convicted under various offences. He is in jail since 6 years. After two years of continuous imprisonment, the petitioner became entitled for

benefit of leave under C.G. Prisoner Leave Rules, 1989. Petitioner preferred an application for grant of leave for the first time which was recommended by the jail authorities. His application for leave under Rule 6 of MP/CG Prisoner Leave Rules, 1989 (for short 'the Rules of 1989') has been arbitrarily rejected by the respondent No.4 by order dated 03.02.2017. It is submitted that the order has been passed in a mechanical and casual manner, which is contrary to the provision under Rule 6 of the Rules of 1989.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has opposed the petition and submits that if the petition is disposed of with a suitable direction in that case State do not have any objection.
4. Perused the material on record the impugned order dated 03.02.2017 **Annexure P-2** by respondent No.4 mentioned that on receiving the application for leave from the petitioner an enquiry was conducted by Superintendent of Police, Mungeli, who in turn called information from SDO Police-Lormi and Police-station-Lalpur, these officers did not recommend for temporary release on leave of the petitioner. Superintendent of Police, Mungeli also communicated to respondent No.4 about this non-recommendation. Solely on this basis, the application for temporary release of petitioner has been rejected by respondent No.4.
5. The requirement for consideration of application for leave the Rules of 1989, have not been complied with. It appears on perusal of the order of respondent No.4 dated 03.02.2017, there is no finding recorded that the release of prisoner would be detrimental to public interest or would be detrimental for the public safety. The report of Superintendent of Police is based on just conjecture and surmises.
6. This Court has clearly laid down in the order dated 18.11.2016 passed in WP(Cr) No.29 of 2017 Rakesh Shende Vs. State of Chhattisgarh that an application for leave by a prisoner, should not be decided in casual and perfunctory manner and, further, directions have also been issued which have to be complied with before disposing the application of leave. Therefore, considering all these facts, it seems appropriate to dispose of this petition, at the motion stage. Hence, this petition is allowed. The order dated 03.02.2017 passed by respondent No.4, is set aside.
7. Respondents are directed to reconsider the application of petitioner in the light of direction, issued in the WP(Cr.) No.192 of 2017 and also in compliance with

the direction, issued in Rakesh Shendre (supra) case.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance on the judgment passed by this Court in **Virendra Kumar Sinha Vs. State of Chhattisgarh** reported in **WPCR No.207/2014** in which after coming to conclusion that the District Magistrate has passed the order arbitrarily in contravention for the provision of Rule 6 of Prisoner Leave Rule, 1989 the order was set aside and the District Magistrate was directed to issue necessary release orders granting leave to the petitioner for the period applied for within 15 days from the date of receipt of the order. It is submitted that despite the orders passed by this Court, respondents acted mechanically in considering and deciding the leave application of prisoner. Hence, a specific direction be made in this respect in the interest of justice.
9. Considering the submission made, without any interference into the authority of the District Magistrate(respondent No.4), it is directed that if, there are no ground to specifically with hold, then order be passed by respondent No.4 for grant of leave to the petitioner for the period of leave preferably within 15 days from the date of receipt of this order.
10. Accordingly, the petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(**Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant**)
JUDGE