

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

2025:PHHC:051811-DB



(218)

CRWP-2459-2025

Date of Decision:- 22.04.2025

SATISH

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK JAIN**

Present: Mr. Robin Singh Hooda, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Samarth Sagar, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

SUDHIR SINGH, J.

The petitioner has sought issuance of a writ in the nature of Certiorari quashing the impugned order dated 18.02.2025 (Annexure P-4), whereby respondent No. 3-Superintendent, District Jail, Jhajjar, Haryana, has declined to grant him regular parole.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has vehemently argued that the father of the petitioner is suffering from an acute respiratory disease and he requires an immediate surgery. It is further argued that there is no male member in his family to shift his father to the

hospital for the aforesaid surgery. It is further argued that while declining the grant of parole to the petitioner, respondent No. 3 has not taken into consideration the aforesaid medical emergency of the father of the petitioner.

3. On the other hand, the learned State counsel appearing for the respondents while referring to the reply filed on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 4 points out that the petitioner is a person of criminal antecedents inasmuch as 10 criminal cases were registered against him. It is further argued that the petitioner is undergoing the sentence of life imprisonment for the offence under Section 302 IPC and being a hard core convicted prisoner, he is not entitled to the parole sought for.

4. We have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

5. The petitioner has sought parole for the emergency medical treatment of his father. It may be noticed that earlier the petitioner had been granted parole for a period of 04 weeks for the purpose of the treatment of his ailing father. It could not be pointed out by the learned counsel for the petitioner as to why the surgery of the petitioner's father could not be conducted during the aforesaid parole period. Thus, it seems that the petitioner intends to avail parole for the same purpose without considering the fact that parole cannot be granted on regular basis. Apart from the said fact, the petitioner is a person of criminal antecedents. Though learned counsel for the petitioner has tried to argue that in most of the cases the petitioner stands acquitted, yet we find that the said fact cannot be considered to be a ground to grant the benefit of

parole to the petitioner especially when his involvement in the multiple cases referred to above has not been disputed.

6. In view of the above, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is accordingly dismissed.

(SUDHIR SINGH)
JUDGE

(ALOK JAIN)
JUDGE

April 22, 2025
Parul

Whether speaking/reasoned:-	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:-	Yes/No