

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP No.2156 of 2019
Date of decision:07.01.2020

Jeet Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- Mr. P.S.Sekhon, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramdeep Partap Singh, DAG, Punjab.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed seeking quashing of impugned order dated 10.05.2019 (Annexure P-2) and for directing the respondents to grant parole to the petitioner-Jeet Singh, to meet his old parents and for repairing his house.

Facts, in brief, are that the petitioner was convicted for ten years on 01.08.2018 in FIR No.32 under Section 22 of [Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985](#) and is in custody for the last more than one year since his conviction. He has not committed any jail offence during his custody. His parents are very old and there is no one in the family to look after them and the condition of his house is also bad and the same is in need of repair. A Municipal Councilor had verified these facts and recommended his release on parole, vide Annexure P-1. The case of the petitioner was recommended for parole by the Superintendent, New District

Jail, Nabha but the District Magistrate, Sangrur, vide impugned order dated 10.05.2019 (Annexure P-2) denied parole of the petitioner.

Upon notice, replies have been filed by the respondents wherein it has been submitted that as the petitioner is involved in three other cases and he is habitual in selling the drugs and in case, he is released on parole then possibility of his indulging in sale of narcotic substances cannot be ruled out. It has been further submitted that on the basis of custody certificate (Annexure R-1) that the petitioner has already undergone more than 03 years and 01 month, out of which 01 year 01 month and 10 days is after conviction and he has never been released on parole.

In support of his averments, learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the judgment rendered by a Division Bench of this Court in **Jassa Singh @ Jassa Vs. State of Punjab 2016(5) RCR (Criminal) 522** as well as judgment of a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in **CWP No.19340 of 2019 titled as Manjit Singh @ Laddu Vs. State of Punjab and others, decided on 02.09.2019** and has submitted that mere likelihood of indulging in trade of drugs would not be a sufficient ground to decline temporary release on parole as mere apprehension cannot be considered as threat to the security of the State or maintenance of public order.

Per contra, learned State counsel has submitted that there are three criminal cases registered against the petitioner and the possibility that he will again engage in selling contraband, cannot be ruled out in case he is released on parole.

Learned counsel for the parties have been heard. Perusal of the impugned order shows that District Magistrate denied the parole to the petitioner solely on the ground that three cases are registered against the petitioner and on the basis of apprehension that if he comes out on parole then he will surely engage in selling drugs and spoil the life of many young people, which will create law and order problem.

The temporary release of prisoner for good conduct is governed by the Punjab Good Conduct Prisoners (Temporary) Release Act, 1962 (hereinafter referred to as "1962 Act"). The only embargo upon the release of the prisoner is laid down in Section 6 of the 1962 Act, which is reproduced as under:-

*"[6. Cases where consultation with District Magistrate not necessary or where prisoners **are not to be released.**__Notwithstanding anything contained in sections 3 and 4,--*

(i) it shall not be necessary to consult the District Magistrate where the State Government is satisfied that the prisoner maintained good conduct during the period of his earlier release under any of the aforesaid sections; and

(ii) no prisoner shall be entitled to be released under this Act, if on the report of the District Magistrate, where consultation with him is necessary, the State Government

or an officer authorised by it in this behalf is satisfied that his release is likely to endanger the security of the State or maintenance of public order".

Section 6 of 1962 Act, came up for consideration before a Division Bench of this Court in Jassa Singh @ Jassa's case (supra). After noticing the provision, the Division Bench held as under:-

"7. In terms of the above Section 6 (ii) of the Act, a prisoner is not entitled to be released under the Act, if on the report of the District Magistrate, where consultation with him is necessary the State Government or an officer authorised by it in this behalf is satisfied that his release is likely to endanger the security of the State or maintenance of public order. Temporary release of a prisoner on parole or furlough as the case may be can be denied if his release is likely to endanger the security of the State or the maintenance of public order. For reaching satisfaction of danger to the security of the State or the maintenance of public order there has to be material before the District Magistrate, for consideration as to whether the release of a prisoner would be a threat to either or both of them. Parole cannot be denied and in fact is not liable to be denied on mere generalization by recording that generally it has been seen that prisoners on release generally engage themselves in smuggling activities causing danger to security

of the country and contraband are again recovered from them. This can be ensured by asking the petitioner/prisoner to execute necessary bonds that while on parole he would maintain good behaviour and will not indulge in any smuggling activities, besides, asking him to furnish heavy surety.”

The expression 'law and order' and 'public order' came up for interpretation before a Division Bench of this Court in **Bansi Lal Versus State of Punjab and others, 2016 (4) RCR (Criminal) 1017** wherein it was held as under:-

“It is something more than mere law and order. Every breach of peace does not lead to public disorder. Maintenance of public order is intended to prevent grave public disorder, which is not the same as maintenance of law and order. The latter is comparatively of a lesser gravity and in fact of local significance. An act which does not affect the public at large or has no impact on it, is not to be taken as an act affecting maintenance of public order. The distinction between law and order and public order is one of degree and extent of reach of the act in question on society. In the case of breach of law and order it affects

individuals directly involved as distinct from the public at large. This would raise a law and order problem only. The true test is the potentiality of the act in question. One act may affect some individuals and local persons while another though of a similar nature may impact the public at large. An act which disturbs the even tempo of life of the public at large affects the maintenance of public order.”

Another Division Bench of this Court in **Ram Chander Vs. State of Punjab and others 2017(3) RCR (Criminal) 340** held that the likelihood of committing a crime while on parole would not be a sufficient ground to decline temporary release on parole as mere likelihood of committing crime is not be taken as an apprehension of a threat to the security of the State or maintenance of public order.

In **Simrandeep Singh Vs. State of Punjab [CWP No.2261 of 2018]**, decided on 17.04.2018, after review of the case law, this Court held that there has to be material with the respondents for entertaining the apprehension that if the convict is released on parole, he will cause danger to the public peace.

In Manjit Singh @ Laddu's case (supra), after examining the cases in which the petitioner was involved, this Court held that apprehension of the State that the convict may indulge in selling of

intoxicant substance is hypothetical and to allay the apprehension, adequate conditions can be imposed upon him and his conduct can be kept under watch in case parole is granted.

In the backdrop of the case law discussed above, facts of the present case may be examined. There is nothing on record to show that conduct of the petitioner in jail has not been found good. The petitioner has never been released on parole earlier. He is involved in three other cases, out of which he was acquitted in one case and in the remaining two cases, he was convicted and sentenced to the period already undergone and was ordered to pay fine which he has deposited. No doubt, the other three cases in which the petitioner was involved were also under the [Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985](#), yet the likelihood of his involvement in similar offence while on parole is not to be taken as an active and real apprehension of threat to the security of the State or to the maintenance of public order as held in [Manjit Singh @ Laddu's case](#) (supra). Moreover, the respondents have not placed on record any material to support the apprehension. Merely on the basis of an apprehension, benefit of parole cannot be denied.

The petitioner has sought temporary release on two counts firstly, he claims that his parents are of an advanced age and there is no one to take care of them at this old age and secondly, he claims that his house is in need of repairs. The claim on both grounds has been verified by a Municipal Councilor, vide Annexure P-1. Though expression “sufficient

cause” as mentioned in Section 3(1)(d) of 1962 Act, has not been defined, but the reasons given by the petitioner for his release on parole will fall within the ambit of “sufficient cause” and therefore, his request is entitled to be accepted.

As a consequence of the above discussion, the writ petition is allowed, the impugned order dated 10.05.2019 (Annexure P-2) is hereby quashed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on parole for a period of six weeks from the date of release to the satisfaction of the District Magistrate concerned, who is further directed to impose such conditions as may be necessary to secure the presence of the petitioner in jail after the parole period is over and to ensure that the temporary release is not misused and by securing the bond of mandatory good conduct with a clear stipulation that in case the petitioner commits any offence during his period of temporary release, his release warrants would be cancelled as provided in Rule 4 of Punjab Good Conduct Prisoners' (Temporary Release) Rules, 1963.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

January 07, 2020
savita

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	Yes