

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-4896-2020

Date of Decision:-27.07.2020.

Gurpreet Singh Guri

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR

Present: Mr. Rajesh Duhan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Suveer Sheokand, Additional A.G., Punjab.

SANJAY KUMAR, J. (Oral)

The petitioner seeks grant of parole for at least 4 weeks to enable him to cultivate paddy.

Notice of motion having been ordered, the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Ahmedgarh, District Sangrur, State of Punjab, filed his reply.

The petitioner suffered conviction in relation to FIR No.125 dated 17.09.2018 on the file of Police Station Amargarh, District Sangrur, registered under provisions of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short, 'the Act of 1985'). He was sentenced to 3 years imprisonment. His appeal against the said judgment is pending consideration. While so, he applied for parole on the ground that there is

18.04.2020, the Senior Superintendent of Police, Sangrur, recorded reasons as to why he was not recommending release of the petitioner on parole.

Reiterating his prayer for grant of parole, the petitioner is now before this Court.

Perusal of the reply reflects that apart from the case in which he was convicted, the petitioner is also facing trial in relation to FIR No.52 dated 05.07.2018 on the file of Police Station Ahmedgarh, District Sangrur, registered under the provisions of the Act of 1985. The Deputy Superintendent of Police, who deposed to the reply, therefore asserted that the petitioner is a habitual offender and if he is released, he would resort to selling drugs again, ruining several lives thereby. The reply also demonstrates that the earlier attempts made by the petitioner to obtain parole proved unsuccessful.

Given the aforestated facts, this Court is of the opinion that no indulgence can be extended to the petitioner at this stage. All the more so, when the reason for his seeking parole is to undertake cultivation activity which can as well be undertaken by even a third party, under arrangement. This Court therefore finds no illegality on the part of the authorities in refusing parole to the petitioner.

The writ petition is devoid of merit and is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

(SANJAY KUMAR)
JUDGE

July 27, 2020.

sandeep

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes / No

Whether Reportable:-

Yes / No.