

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
AURANGABAD BENCH, AT AURANGABAD.**

Criminal Writ Petition No. 0075 of 2018

District : Nashik

Shoeb Aashik Ali Kazi (In Prison),
Convict No. : C/8524,
Age : 28 years,
Nashik Road Central Prison,
Nashik.

.. Petitioner.

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
Through the Secretary,
Home Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai - 32.
2. The Additional Director
General of Police &
Inspector General of Prisons,
State of Maharashtra,
Pune.
3. The Deputy Inspector General
of Prisons (Jail),
Central Department,
Central Region,
Aurangabad.
4. The Jail Superintendent,
Nashik Road Central Prison,
Nashik.
5. The Assistant Commissioner
of Police,
Devnar Division, Mumbai,
Dist. Mumbai.

.. Respondents.

.....

*Mr. Bhushan S. Dhawale, Advocate (appointed),
for the petitioner.*

*Mr. S.W. Munde, Addl. Public Prosecutor, for
respondent nos.01 to 05.*

.....

**CORAM : PRASANNA B. VARALE &
SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI, JJ.**

DATE : 22ND FEBRUARY 2018

ORAL JUDGMENT [Per Smt. Vibha Kankanwadi, J.] :

Heard learned Counsel (appointed) for the petitioner and the learned Addl. Public Prosecutor for the respondents.

02. By the present petition, the petitioner - convict no. C-8524 is challenging the order dated 15.06.2017, passed by respondent no.03 i.e. Deputy Inspector General of Prisons, Aurangabad, thereby rejecting the application made by the petitioner seeking furlough leave. The petitioner has also challenged the order dated 03.11.2017, passed by respondent no.02 i.e. Addl. D.G.P. & Inspector General of Prisons, Pune, thereby rejecting appeal preferred by the petitioner.

03. The prayer for furlough leave of the petitioner was rejected on the ground that the police report was adverse to the petitioner. Another ground for rejection was, the appeal preferred by the petitioner against his conviction and sentence is pending before this Court. Thereafter, it is

mentioned, that on earlier occasion when the petitioner was released on leave, he reported late by one day. The impugned order further mentions, that the petitioner is likely to commit similar offence, if released on leave and he may cause danger to prosecution witnesses and their relatives. The prayer for furlough is also rejected on the ground that the ratio of judgment delivered by this Court at principal seat, in Criminal Writ Petition No. 4017 of 2016, in the matter of *Smt. Rubina Suleman Memon Vs. The State of Maharashtra & others*, dated 22nd December 2016, the petitioner is not entitled to be released on furlough leave. Lastly, the impugned order mentions that there is no recommendation from Jail Superintendent.

04. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the grounds mentioned for rejection of prayer for furlough leave are vague and unsustainable. He submits, that though police report is stated to be adverse, no instances are quoted. Learned Counsel submits, that the pendency of appeal preferred by the petitioner cannot be a ground for rejection of prayer for furlough leave. He also submits that the decision of this Court in the case of *Smt. Rubina Suleman Memon (supra)* has no bearing to the facts of the present case. Learned Counsel for the petitioner has, therefore, urged that the petition be allowed and the petitioner may be released on furlough leave.

05. Learned Counsel for the petitioner further

submitted that in so far as the ground in respect of pendency of appeal, is concerned, the Division Bench of this Court at Nagpur Bench was pleased to consider this very aspect. Our attention is invited to the copy of an unreported order dated April 26, 2017, in Criminal Writ Petition (CWP) No. 196 of 2017 and Criminal Writ Petition (CWP) No. 97 of 2017, in the matter of *Arun s/o. Gulab Gawli & another Vs. State of Maharashtra*, through its Secretary, Home Department & others. It would be useful to refer observations of the Division Bench in paras 2 and 3 of the order, which read as under :

"2. The learned PP submits that the appropriate Authorities have advised State Government which is taking some steps and those steps may result in amendment to the Rules. She seeks time till after vacation to make a definite statement in this respect.

3. The learned Senior Advocate has no objection provided the request of the petitioner for grant of furlough in Criminal Writ Petition No. 97 of 2017 is considered. He also adds that from the response of the respondents, it appears that they have accepted the inconsistency or arbitrariness in the provision which denies furlough to the prisoners whose appeal challenging conviction is pending and bail application is rejected by the High Court. " (Emphasis supplied)

The Division Bench, in view of the statement made before the Court and on considering other grounds,

namely, a vague police report and the track of leave of the petitioner, found that there was no reason to deny furlough leave. The Division Bench accordingly directed release of the petitioner in Criminal Writ Petition No. 97 of 2017 on furlough leave, within two weeks from the date of the order, after obtaining appropriate bonds, undertakings from the convict and his relatives / sureties.

06. Learned Addl. Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents vehemently opposed the petition and urged that the petition be dismissed.

07. Perusal of the record show that though the prayer of the petitioner for furlough leave is rejected on the ground of adverse police report, no specific instances of incriminating nature are quoted. So far as the ground, that the appeal preferred by the petitioner against his conviction and sentence is pending before this Court, same is untenable. Filing of an appeal against conviction and sentence is the statutory right of a convict and it has no nexus with grant or rejection of the prayer for furlough leave. Thereafter, the ground that on earlier occasion when the petitioner was granted furlough leave, he had reported late by one day, is concerned, for the said late reporting, the petitioner was reprimanded. The ground, that in view of the ratio laid down by this Court in the case of *Smt. Rubina Suleman Memon (supra)* is also untenable. In

the said case, the convict was undergoing sentence under the Terrorist and Destructive Activities Act, 1987, which is not a case of the present petitioner. The petitioner is not suffering punishment for any act under the provisions of TADA. The last ground, that there is no recommendation of Jail Superintendent is also not tenable. The leave sanctioning authority can *suo motu* call recommendation or otherwise from the Jail Superintendent.

08. There is no dispute, that the very circular which is referred to in the order prevents the prisoner to avail the benefit and statement was made before the Division Bench at Nagpur Bench, that the State Government is in process to re-think the rule and if necessary, cause an amendment to rule. We may also take note of the decision by Division Bench of this Court at this Bench, in Criminal Writ Petition No. 1010 of 2017, in the matter of *Shivaji Vs. The State of Maharashtra & others*, decided on 13.10.2017. So also, a useful reference can be made to the decision of Division Bench of this Court at this Bench, in Criminal Writ Petition No. 1237 of 2017, in the matter of *Hariom Vijay Pandey Vs. The Superintendent & others*, decided on the same day. In both these petitions, the Division Bench of this Court had taken note of the above referred judgment of the Division Bench at Nagpur Bench, in the matter of *Arun s/o. Gulab Gawli & another (supra)* and the benefit was then given to the

petitioners therein.

09. Further, we may refer to a Full Bench judgment of this Court at principal seat in the matter of *S. Sant Singh @ Pilli Singh Ajit Singh Kalyani Vs. Secretary, Home Department, Govt. of Maharashtra & others* [2006 (2) Mh.L.J. 422 = 2006(1) Bom.C.R.(Cri.) 743]. Though this is the case which was pronounced prior to Government Circular dated 26.08.2016, yet it appears that at that time also, there was similar provision, wherein it has been observed in paras 26 and 27 of the judgment, thus :

"26. The provisions of law clearly disclose that once a person is convicted and sentence is imposed by the Court, and such person is sent to jail as a prisoner the execution of the sentence imposed upon him is to be done by the appropriate Government in accordance with the rules framed in that regard. Once a person is in prison he would be governed by the Prisons Act, and the Rules framed thereunder. The Prison Rules clearly provide for grant of parole. It is for the Competent Authority or the Government to decide as to whether any Parole for any particular period is to be granted to the convicts undergoing imprisonment period and on the conditions as may be fixed. It is, therefore, clear that merely because a convict prefers an appeal before the Appellate Court, that would not divest the Government of its powers under the Prison Act to deal with the management of the convict by following the rules framed under the said Act.

27. From this, it is clear that the powers of the State to grant Parole are not fettered even if the appeal of the convict

is pending before the Court. Thus, the Competent Authority or the Government would have the legal competence to entertain an application for parole by following the procedure set out under the Prison Rules to meet the contingencies stated therein. The exercise of such power would not be in any way be in conflict with the powers exercised under section 389 and/or Section 432 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. It is also evident that the amendments carried out in this scheme of Rules 19 and 25 in the year 1989 have provided for adequate safeguards so as to ensure that the benefit of parole leave is not misused or abused so as to defeat or nullify the Courts order passed under Section 389 of the Code of Criminal Procedure as was noticed in *Jayant Veerappa Shetty Vs. State of Maharashtra [1986(1) Bom.C.R.311 = 1986 Cri.L.J. 1298]*. "

Thus, we find that this reason cannot be a hurdle in the way of the petitioner.

10. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, we are of the opinion that the learned Counsel for the petitioner has made out a case for grant of relief as prayed in the petition.

11. In the result, the criminal writ petition is allowed.

The impugned order dated 15.06.2017, passed by respondent no.03 i.e. Deputy Inspector General of Prisons, Aurangabad, so also, order dated 03.11.2017, passed by respondent no.02 i.e. Addl. D.G.P. & Inspector General of Prisons, Pune, are quashed and

set aside. The petitioner is directed to be released on furlough leave after complying with necessary formalities.

12. Learned Advocate Mr. B.S. Dhawale was appointed to represent case of the petitioner. His fees is quantified at Rs. 3,000/- [Rupees three thousand].

(Smt. Vibha Kankanwadi)
JUDGE

(Prasanna B. Varale)
JUDGE

.....