

234 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRWP-3699-2022 (O&M)
Date of Decision:13.09.2022

ANOOP SINGH ... PETITIONER
VS.
STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS .. RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURI

Present : Mr. Prateek Rathee, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Garg, AAG, Haryana.

VIVEK PURI, J.(ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to release him on parole for a period of six weeks.

In the reply, the categoric assertion of the respondents is to the effect that no such application for release of the petitioner on parole has been submitted. Had any such application been moved, the appropriate orders would have been passed thereupon.

However, learned State counsel submits that the application alleged to have been submitted to respondent No.4 is on record as Annexure P-2 and appropriate orders on the said application shall be passed by competent authority within a period of three weeks.

Faced with this situation, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petition may be disposed of in view of the categoric submission of learned State counsel.

Accordingly, the petition is disposed of with a direction to pass appropriate orders on the application contained at Annexure P-2 submitted for release of petitioner on parole by the competent authority within a period of three weeks, in accordance with law.

13.09.2022
smriti

(VIVEK PURI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No