

129  
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

SANJIV KUMAR SHARMA  
10/11/2018 16:07  
I attest to the accuracy and  
authenticity of this document

CWP-30387-2018 (O/M)  
Date of decision : 30.11.2018

Jasmer Singh ..... Petitioner (s)  
Versus  
State of Haryana and others ..... Respondent (s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Ravinder Bangar, Advocate,  
for petitioner.

-.-

-.-

KULDIP SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner has sought quashing of speaking order dated 23.11.2018 (Annexure-P-1), passed by Superintendent, District Jail, Yamuna Nagar (respondent No. 4), vide which application of petitioner for grant of four weeks parole to attend Bhat ceremony of sister's son, was dismissed.

It comes out that earlier also, petitioner had approached this Court by way of filing CWP-28983-2018, which was taken up on 21.11.2018 and was disposed of on same day with a direction to Superintendent of Jail, District Jail, Yamuna Nagar, to process same and pass speaking order within five days.

Now, speaking order dated 23.11.2018 (Annexure-P-1) has been passed by respondent No. 4.

Perusal of speaking order shows that petitioner had availed six weeks parole and surrendered at jail gate on 13.11.2018. On next day, petitioner filed another petition on 14.11.2018. Within a period of one week i.e. on 21.11.2018, earlier writ petition (CWP-28983-2018) was filed by petitioner before this Court on the ground of nephew's marriage. Now, present petition has been filed for different ground i.e. Bhat ceremony of sister's son marriage.

Respondent No. 4 has taken view that parole can be granted only for once either under Section 3 (1) (b) or under Section 3 (1) (d) of Haryana Good Conduct Prisoners (Temporary Release) Act, 1988, and not both separately during a calendar year.

I am of view that only one week earlier, petitioner had availed parole for six weeks. Therefore, Bath ceremony could have been performed during that period. Therefore, it appears that petitioner is trying to invent new ground to get another parole. No ground to interfere in impugned order. Petition is therefore dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)  
JUDGE

30.11.2018  
sjks

Whether speaking order : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No