

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.6292 OF 2021

Sunil Sadanand Jambhalekar	...Petitioner
<i>Versus</i>	
The State of Maharashtra	...Respondent

Mr. Subir Sarkar, Appointed Advocate, for Petitioner.
Mr. K. V. Saste, APP for Respondent-State.

CORAM : SUNIL B. SHUKRE &
M.M. SATHAYE, JJ.

DATED : 3rd April, 2023

P.C. :

. Heard.

2. Rule. Rule is made returnable forthwith. Heard finally by consent of the parties.

3. The Petitioner has a grievance that the deduction of the days for which he had over stayed during the period of his Parole and Furlough from the remission in sentence granted to the Petitioner has not been done properly. However, on going through the reply of Deputy Inspector General of Prisons, we find the grievance of the Petitioner to be baseless. The Petitioner has been properly given benefit of Clause 4(B) of the Guidelines dated 15.03.2010, they being the most beneficial guidelines

amongst all the guidelines and accordingly, the Petitioner has been declared to be entitled to be released prematurely from jail on his completion of actual sentence for a period of 22 years. Out of 22 years period, the Petitioner has already undergone the sentence of 21 years, 3 months and 10 days as of 31.01.2023. The Petitioner thus is due for his premature release somewhere in October 2023. The calculations made by Prisons Authority and disclosed in reply of the Deputy Inspector General of Prisons are based upon the figures available in the record of Prisons Authority and there is nothing on record to show that the calculations so made are wrong.

4. We, therefore, find that there is no cause for the Petitioner to have any grievance against the Prison Authority. The Petition is, therefore, dismissed.

5. Rule is discharged.

(M.M. SATHAYE, J.)

(SUNIL B. SHUKRE, J.)