

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No.9518 of 2018
Date of decision: April 20, 2018

Pardeep ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others ...Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rakesh Kumar Jain

Present: Mr. Randeep Singh Dhull, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Rakesh Kumar Jain, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has prayed for extension of parole already granted to him. It is averred that the period of 25 days' parole for the purpose of agricultural work is very less.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and taking into consideration the facts and circumstances narrated in the petition, I do not find it to be a fit case for the purpose of granting extension of parole as the period of 25 days is quite sufficient for the purpose of agricultural work, i.e. harvesting of crops etc., otherwise the reason, as projected by learned counsel for the petitioner, that the petitioner would need some more time to manage other affairs of the family appears to be a lame excuse and cannot be accepted.

In view of the above, I do not find any merit in the present petition for the purpose of interference by this Court and hence, the same is hereby dismissed.

April 20, 2018
vinod*

(Rakesh Kumar Jain)
Judge

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No