

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

206

CRWP-10963-2022

Date of decision:- 09.08.2023

Gurpreet Singh @ Baba

.... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Ripudaman Singh Sidhu,, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Alankar Narula, AAG, Punjab.

Manisha Batra, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed by the petitioner-Gurpreet Singh @ Baba under Articles 226 of the Constitution of India for setting aside order dated 12.08.2022, passed by the District Magistrate, Malerkotla, (Annexure P-2) 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 Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana vide judgment dated 13.07.2021 in case bearing FIR No.92, dated 26.07.2016 registered under Sections 302/34/120-B of IPC, Section 25 of Arms Act and Sections 10, 11, 13, 17, 20 of Unlawful Activity (Prevention) Act, 1967, registered at Police Station

Dehlon. He had been sentenced as under:-

Under Section	Sentence	Fine	In default of payment of fine
302 of IPC	Life imprisonment	Rs.1 Lac	RI for 02 years
120-B of IPC	RI for 05 years	Rs.10,000/-	RI for 6 months
307/120-B of IPC	RI for 08 years	Rs.25,000/-	RI for 01 year
25 of Arms Act	RI for 03 years	Rs.5,000/-	RI for 02 months

Appeal bearing No.CRA-D-446-2021 has been filed by him against the said judgment, which is pending before this Court.

The petitioner approached respondent No.2 to release him on parole for 8 weeks to meet his family members. Respondent No.2 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 12.08.2022. Feeling aggrieved, he has filed the present petition.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that respondent No.2 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, along with custody certificate, which are taken on record. The parole case of the petitioner was duly initiated and was rejected by respondent No.2. 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.2 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 12.08.2022 is set aside. The petitioner is ordered to be released on parole for a period of four 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

09.08.2023

pooja saini

Whether speaking/reasoned

: Yes/No

Whether reportable

: Yes/No