



CRWP-9611-2024

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(137)

CRWP-9611-2024
Date of Decision : 03.10.2024

Satinder Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Monty Goyal, Advocate and
Mr. J.S. Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pardeep Bajaj, DAG, Punjab.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(ORAL)

- Through the instant petition, filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, a prayer is made for extension of parole to the petitioner under Section 3 (1) (d) of the Punjab Goods Conduct Prisoner (Temporary Release) Act, 1962, for a period of 04 weeks, to take care his wife.
- The instant petition is a misconceived motion, inasmuch as, despite the petitioner being seized of an alternate and efficacious statutory remedy for redressal of his grievance, and without approaching the authorities concerned, yet he has sidetracked the said remedy, and has straightway accessed this Court, through instituting the present petition.
- In such circumstances, this Court refrains from exercising its power, as envisaged under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India. Accordingly, the instant petition is **disposed of**.

4. However, liberty is reserved to the petitioner to recourse the alternative available statutory remedy(ies), before the appropriate authority/forum concerned, at the first instance, for the relief, as sought in the instant petition.
5. In case, the petitioner file an application for the relief as sought in the instant petition, the learned trial Court concerned, is directed to decide the same within two days.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

October 03, 2024
Manpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No