

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRWP-10775-2021

Date of decision: 15.11.2021

PARVEEN ALIAS LILU

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ**

Present : Ms. Veerpal Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA. J. (ORAL)

This case has been taken up through Video Conferencing via Webex facility in the light of Pandemic Covid-19 situation and as per instructions.

Challenge in the instant petition is to the order dated 06.11.2021 (Annexure P-3) passed by the respondent No.3/Superintendent of Jail, Rohtak, declining the request of the petitioner for grant of emergency parole for a period of six weeks.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that an application had been submitted by the petitioner seeking parole as per provisions of the Haryana Good Conduct Prisoners (Temporary Release) Act, 1988 to take care of his pregnant wife. It is argued that the wife of the petitioner is not feeling well and there has been a termination of pregnancy and under such circumstances, wife of the petitioner is to be accorded requisite medical treatment and she would be in need of emotional support.

We have heard learned counsel at length and have perused the pleadings on record.

The impugned order dated 06.11.2021 at Annexure P-3 would reveal that the factum as regards the ill health of the wife of the petitioner

was got verified by the Superintendent, District Jail, Rohtak through Station House Officer, Police Station, Sadar Rohtak. Such exercise of verification reveals that Preeti wife of the petitioner herein was pregnant and suffered a miscarriage on 14.10.2021. It is further averred that the health condition of Preeti is now normal and further more mother of the petitioner is present at home to take care of her daughter-in-law.

Under Section 3 (1) (a) of the Haryana Good Conduct Prisoners (Temporary Release) Act, 1988, it would open for a convict to be released temporarily, if the State Government is satisfied that:-

“a member of the prisoner's family had died or is seriously ill or the prisoner himself is seriously ill”

We are of the considered view that rejection of the request of the petitioner for emergency parole is on valid and cogent reasons and on verification of the health status of his wife and as per relevant statutory provisions. Even otherwise no material or document has been placed on record and neither has any such material been adverted to during the course of arguments which would indicate the wife of the petitioner to be suffering from any serious ailment.

We find no infirmity in the decision taken by the competent authority.

Writ petition is dismissed.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

15.11.2021
Vishal sharma

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