

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

**CRWP-9947-2022 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 27.10.2022**

Joginder Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present:- Mr. Balraj Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. H.S. Sullar, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA J. (Oral)

Instant petition has been filed seeking issuance of directions to the respondent-authorities to extend the concession of parole that already stood granted to the petitioner.

Counsel for the parties have been heard.

The uncontroverted facts are that petitioner having faced trial stands convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment in FIR No.82 dated 14.08.2014 under Sections 120-B, 302 and 427 IPC, registered at Police Station Sherpur, District Sangrur.

Petitioner was confined to Central Jail Bathinda.

Pursuant to an application having been filed, petitioner is stated to have been released on parole w.e.f. 24.08.2022 till 20.10.2022.

Extension of parole for a period of 30 days is sought on the ground that a male child was born on 09.09.2022 out of wedlock and that the mother of the child (wife of the petitioner) is not in good health.

It has been averred in para 5 of the petition that wife of the

petitioner is on bed and she needs an attendant.

Instant petition came up for preliminary hearing before this Court on 19.10.2022 and while issuing notice for today, the benefit of parole that had already been granted was extended till the next date of hearing.

During the course of resumed hearing today, Mr. H.S. Sullar, Sr. DAG, Punjab, upon instructions from ASI Manoj Kumar, P.S. Sherpur, District Sangrur, has informed the Court that wife of the petitioner was examined by a '*board of doctors*' on 22.10.2022 and it has been opined that the mother as also the new born child are stable and in good health.

Counsel for the petitioner is not in a position to rebut or to refute the opinion of the board of doctors.

There would be no occasion for this Court to take a contrary view in the matter.

The opinion of the board of doctors would prevail in such matters.

In view of the above, this Court is not inclined to accept the prayer of the petitioner as regards extension of concession of parole.

Petition dismissed.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

October 27, 2022

shweta

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No