

210

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRWP-11020-2023

Date of decision:01.02.2024

KARAN SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURESHWAR THAKUR
HON'BLR MR. JUSTICE LALIT BATRA**

Present: Mr. Virender Partap Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Gaurav Partap Singh Pathania, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jaswinder Singh Arora, DAG, Punjab

SURESHWAR THAKUR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petitioner has been convicted and sentenced by the learned Trial Court, Pathankot, to undergo rigorous imprisonment for life, in FIR bearing No.103 of 15.09.2014, under Sections 302, 326, 324, 452, 148, 149 of IPC, registered at Police Station Sujampur, District Pathankot.
2. The above made verdict of conviction, and, consequent therewith sentence(s) (supra), as became imposed upon the convict, has been challenged by him through his rearing a criminal appeal bearing No. CRA-D-983-2022, before this Court.
3. During the pendency of the appeal (supra) before this Court, the convict preferred an application, claiming therein the relief of his becoming released on parole, lasting upto a duration of 8 weeks, rather for the relevant purpose. The authority concerned, after eliciting the report of the police officer concerned, has made a declining order on the relevant application, and, the above declining order, which becomes enclosed in Annexure P-1 to the instant petition, has led the petitioner to access this Court.

4. A reading of the declining order (Annexure P-1) reveals, that the presence of the petitioner shall cause threat to peace, security and public order of the State, thus upon the convict being released on parole. However, the above purported threat of adverse effect on the society, rather becoming engendered, upon the petitioner becoming released on parole, is not founded upon any credible and tangible evidence. Therefore, since in the wake of the above, the declining order (supra) is obviously made with a complete lack of application of mind, and/or is surmisely drawn, therefore, the same is required to be rejected.

5. Therefore, the petition is allowed, and, the impugned order is quashed and set aside. The petitioner is ordered to be released on parole for 28 days, from the prison concerned, but subject to his furnishing personal and surety bonds in a sum of Rs. 1 lakh each, and, to the satisfaction of the District Magistrate concerned, in whose jurisdiction he is extantly lodged, and, but with an undertaking therein that immediately on expiry of the afore period, he shall re-step into the prison concerned. The stepping outside the prison of the convict-petitioner shall commence in the evening of 02.02.2024, and, shall last uptill the morning of 01.03.2024.

6. If the above condition is breached, and, the petitioner does not re-step into the prison concerned, immediately on the expiry of 28 days, i.e. on 01.03.2024, thereupon, liberty is reserved to the jurisdictional SHO concerned, to forthwith arrest the petitioner, and, to thereafter produce him before the jurisdictional Magistrate concerned, for the latter making an order for the petitioner becoming committed to the prison concerned.

(SURESHWAR THAKUR)
JUDGE

01.02.2024

Ithlesh

Whether speaking/reasoned:-
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No

(LALIT BATRA)
JUDGE