

2025:PHHC:161620



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

113

CRWP-10998-2023

Decided on:19.11.2025

Sunil @ Shooter

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bhardwaj

Present: Mr. Sanjeev Majra, Advocate, for
Mr. Randeep S. Dhull, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the present petition, filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for quashing the order dated 21.09.2023 passed by the Superintendent, Central Jail-I, Hisar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner applied for grant of parole for a period of 10 weeks, however, the respondent-authorities have declined the same on the ground that the petitioner is a hard core criminal and, thus, before completing 5 years of custody, he is not entitled for the grant of parole as per the provisions of Section 6(3) of the Haryana Good Conduct Prisoners (Temporary Release) Act, 2022. He submits that the petitioner had earlier been granted furlough of two weeks from 17.03.2022 to 01.04.2022 and, thereafter, 10 weeks parole from 05.10.2022 to 15.12.2022. He, thus, submits that the stand taken by the respondent-authorities in declining parole to the petitioner in itself is not sustainable when despite being a hard

2025:PHHC:161620



core criminal, he had already availed parole for 10 weeks and furlough for 2 weeks and had never misused the same.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel, on instructions, apprises the Court that the petitioner had earlier filed an application for grant of parole before the Superintendent, Central Jail-I, Hisar, whereas he has already been shifted to the Central Jail-II, Hisar and hence, the Competent Authority to deal with and decide parole application of the petitioner is the Superintendent, Central Jail-II, Hisar, and he should approach the said Competent Authority afresh for grant of parole.

4. In view of the above, the present petition is hereby allowed, impugned order dated 21.09.2023 (Annexure P-1) is set aside and the petitioner is relegated to his remedy of filing fresh application for grant of parole before the Competent Authority, i.e. Superintendent, Central Jail-II, Hisar, who is directed that if the petitioner files an application for grant of parole before the Competent Authority within a period of 10 days from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order, in that event, the same shall be decided by the Competent Authority within a period of four weeks thereafter positively. The petitioner would be at liberty to avail his remedy in case any further cause of action arises.

November 19, 2025
vinod*

(Rajesh Bhardwaj)
Judge

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: NO/YES
Whether Reportable: NO/YES