



120

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

**CRWP-961-2025
DECIDED ON: 03.02.2025**

SHADAB**.....PETITIONER**

VERSUS

THE STATE OF HARYANA**.....RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL**

Present: Mr. Hoshier Singh Jaswal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Baljinder Singh Virk, Sr. DAG Haryana

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for quashing/setting aside the impugned order dated 09.01.2025 (Annexure P-4) passed by respondent no.1 vide which the claim of the petitioner for grant of Regular Parole has been rejected.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been convicted in an FIR No.113 dated 14.05.2006, for the commission of an offence punishable under Sections 395, 396, 397 and 412 IPC, registered at Police Station Dharuhera, District Rewari and has been sentenced for life imprisonment. The petitioner has undergone the total sentence of 20 years and an actual sentence of 17 years. He is not involved in any other case. He had availed parole in the year 2012 & 2023 and had promptly returned on the expiry of the period of parole.

Learned State counsel submits that the case of the petitioner has been rejected by the Divisional Commissioner, Karnal Division as the District Magistrate, Meerut has opined that on the release of the petitioner on parole, the possibility of his committing another offence cannot be ruled out. He further

submits that the petitioner has undergone total sentence of 20 years, 01 month and an actual sentence of 17 years 17 days as on 04.07.2023.

Heard.

The petitioner has been convicted in an FIR No.113 dated 14.05.2006, for the commission of an offence punishable under Sections 395, 396, 397 and 412 IPC, by the judgment and order dated 05.02.2009 and sentenced to undergo life imprisonment. As per the custody certificate, he has undergone total sentence along with remissions for over 20 years and without remissions an actual sentence of 17 years. The petitioner had earlier been released on parole and had promptly surrendered. There is no material to suggest that his conduct was not good or he had misused the concession of parole. The reason mentioned in the impugned order (Annexure P-4) with regard to the correspondence received from the District Magistrate that the possibility of his committing another offence is not ruled out is too vague and nebulous to deny the concession of parole. It is necessary for the petitioner to meet his family members to facilitate his reformation and integration in the society as a responsible citizen.

Consequently, the impugned order dated 09.01.2025 (Annexure P-4) is set aside and the petition is allowed. The petitioner shall be granted parole for a period of 08 weeks subject to his furnishing necessary surety bonds to the satisfaction of the competent authority and on expiry of 08 weeks, he shall surrender to the concerned jail by 5 PM.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

03.02.2025

Meenu

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