

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

204

CRWP-9431-2023

Date of decision:-07.10.2023

Satish Kumar

.... Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present: Mr. H.S. Jaswal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sharan Sethi, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

Manisha Batra, J.

The present petition has been filed by the petitioner- Satish Kumar under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for setting aside order dated 22.08.2023, passed by the Divisional Commissioner, Ambala Division, Ambala, (Annexure P-1) whereby the request of the petitioner for grant of parole had been rejected.

The present petition has been filed by the petitioner on the ground that he was held guilty and convicted by the trial Court, vide judgment dated 06.10.2021 in case bearing FIR No.637, dated 21.09.2016, registered under Sections 302 and 506 of IPC, registered at Police Station City Jagadhri. He had been sentenced as follows:-

Under Section	Sentence	Fine	In default of payment of fine
302/506 of IPC	Life imprisonment	Rs.53,000/-	RI for 2 years and 3 months

Criminal appeal (CRA-D-607-DB-2021) has been filed by him against the said judgment, which is pending before this Court.

The petitioner approached respondent No.1 to release him on parole for 10 weeks to meet his family members. Respondent No.3 after receiving the report from concerned police Station, did not recommend the parole case of the petitioner and rejected the same vide the impugned order dated 22.08.2023. Feeling aggrieved, he has filed the present petition.

Learned counsel for the petitioner aruged that respondent No.1 had rejected his prayer for grant of parole without any justifiable ground and therefore, it is urged that the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer made by petitioner by way of reply filed in the Court, which is taken on record. The parole case of the petitioner was duly initiated and was rejected by respondent No.1. There were chances of petitioner's disturbing the State security and maintenance of public order if extended benefit of parole. Hence, it was urged that the petition did not deserve to be allowed.

We have heard learned counsel for the parties.

As per the reply submitted by the State, the petitioner has concealed the true facts in the present petition. The only reason given by

respondent No.1 for rejecting the prayer made by the petitioner is that his release might disturb the law and order and may lead to danger to the State security. This apprehension, however, is not substantiated by any material and hence cannot be made a ground to reject the prayer made by the petitioner. It is relevant to mention that Section 3(1)(aa) of the Punjab Good Conduct Imprisoners' (Temporary Release) Act, 1962, permits temporary release of prisoner on parole on the grounds as mentioned therein.

Taking all these circumstances into consideration, the petition is hereby allowed. Impugned order dated 22.08.2023 is set aside. The petitioner is ordered to be released on parole for a period of 6 weeks subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned District Magistrate.

Concerned District Magistrate, may impose such conditions as may be necessary to secure the presence of the petitioner in jail after the parole is over and to ensure that the temporary release is not misused.

(RITU BAHRI) (MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE JUDGE

07.10.2023

pooja saini

Whether speaking/reasoned

: Yes/No

Whether reportable

: Yes/No