

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO.4687 OF 2025

Laxman Bhubharamji Parihar

... Petitioner

V/s.

The State of Maharashtra & Ors

... Respondents

Mr. Prakash N. Wagh for the Petitioner.

Ms. Madhavi H. Mhatre, A.P.P. for Respondent No.1-State.

**CORAM : A. S. GADKARI AND
RANJITSINHA RAJA BHONSALE, JJ.
DATE : 15th October, 2025.**

P.C. :

1) By this Petition under Article 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India, Petitioner has impugned Orders dated 3rd July, 2024 and 28th March, 2025, passed by the Additional Director General of Police and Inspector General of Prisons, Maharashtra rejecting his Application for furlough leave.

2) Heard Mr.Wagh, learned Advocate for the Petitioner and Ms.Mhatre, learned APP for the State. Peruse the record and the Affidavit of Mr.Pramod Wagh, Superintendent of Taloja Central Prison, Navi Mumbai, dated 11th October, 2025.

3) Record discloses that, when the Petitioner was earlier released on parole leave on 10th November, 2005, he over stayed for a period of 352 days. In the year 2010, when the Petitioner was again released on furlough

leave on 23rd June, 2010, he again over stayed for a period of 1346 days. On both the said occasions, the Petitioner was required to be arrested by the police and bring back to the Jail Authority.

3.1) The Superintendent of Police, Pali, Rajasthan in its report dated 23rd December, 2019, has expressed an apprehension that, if the Petitioner is release on furlough leave again he will abscond. The Superintendent of Police has also expressed his apprehension that, the Petitioner himself will not surrender to the Jail Authority on his own and will have to be traced by the Police. The Superintendent of Taloja Central Prison has also gave an adverse remark of not releasing the Petitioner on furlough leave.

4) After taking into consideration the over all view of the matter, we are of the opinion that, the Competent Authority while passing the Orders 3rd July, 2024 and 28th March, 2025, has not committed any error. Taking into consideration, the background of the Petitioner, it will be apposite to deny the the benefit of furlough leave to him.

The Petition is accordingly dismissed.

(RANJITSINHA RAJA BHONSALE, J.)

(A.S. GADKARI, J.)