

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

CRWP No.1544 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: May 24, 2017

Ram Kishan

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.A.S.Trikha, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Parveen Aggarwal, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

The petitioner has filed this criminal writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for directing the respondents to consider parole application for house repairs of petitioner after acquittal/not found guilty of the charge under Section 8/9 of HGPC 1988.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel appeared and contested the petition.

Learned State counsel argued that no representation to the Jail Superintendent was given before filing of this petition. During the pendency of this case, a report was called qua representations Annexures P-2 and P-3, which were annexed with this petition. Both the representations have already been ordered to be filed after consideration vide order dated

15.04.2017 and therefore, the present petition has become infructuous.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that vide order dated 15.04.2017, the representations Annexures P-2 and P-3 which have been annexed in this petition, have been considered and filed after consideration. The relief sought in the present petition is for considering the parole application, which has already been considered by the competent authority.

Therefore, present petition has become infructuous and the same is dismissed. However, the petitioner is at liberty to challenge the order dated 15.04.2017 by filing separate petition, as per law.

May 24, 2017
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No