



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.**

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 916 OF 2025

PRAMOD BALKRUSHNA VAIDYA

Vrs.

PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF HOME AFFAIRS, MANTRALAYA, MUMBAI AND
ANOTHER

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's Orders
or directions and Registrar's order

Court's or Judge's Order

Ms. Sunita D. Paul, Advocate for petitioner.
Ms. N. R. Tripathi, A. P. P. for respondent Nos.1 and 2.

**CORAM: ANIL L. PANSARE AND
NIVEDITA P. MEHTA, JJ.**

DATE : 12/01/2026

1. Heard.
2. The challenge is to the order dated 08/04/2025 passed by respondent No.1 and further seeking direction to consider the case of the petitioner afresh in terms of the revised Government Guidelines dated 15/10/2010 for premature release.
3. We have gone through the impugned order and the revised guidelines. These guidelines are issued for premature release of prisoners undergoing life sentence. Various categories of crimes have been mentioned with corresponding benefit of remission depending on the nature of crime.
4. The petitioner is categorized under Clause 2(c). It pertains to offences relating to crime against women and minors where a crime is committed with

exceptional violence and with brutality or death of victim due to burns.

5. According to the petitioner, he falls in category 2(a) where the convict has no previous criminal history and has committed the murder in an individual capacity in a moment of anger and without premeditation.

6. Thus, what is relevant is the manner in which the offence has been committed. Clause(a) refers to the convict who has no previous criminal history and has committed offence in a moment of anger. Clause(c) refers to crime committed with exceptional violence and / or with brutality and death of victim due to burns.

7. In the present case, petitioner has committed murder by setting ablaze his own wife. The relevant finding finds place in Para No.76 of the Judgment, which in fact, is referred to in the order impugned. Para No.76 as mentioned in the impugned order reads as under :-

"76. In the present case, it has come on record that, deceased Sushma was the wife of accused and in the relevant period of incident was residing in the company of accused. The contents of the dying declaration, Exh.44 disclosed the recitals that, the accused was suspecting on the character of deceased Sushama, was raising quarrel with her. The contents of both Exh-44 and Exh.40 disclosed the recitals that at the time of incident the accused has raised quarrel with Sushama and poured kerosene on the person of deceased Sushma and set her offire. The contents of post mortem report disclosed 81% burn injuries as sustained to deceased Sushama. In that case, considering the above evidence the only conclusion can be drawn that, the accused has intentionally and knowingly caused the death of deceased Sushama. Therefore, I hold that, the act of the accused constitutes the offence of culpable homicide amounting to murder."

8. As could be seen, the petitioner has raised quarrel suspecting the character of his wife, he has then set her ablaze. She suffered 81% burn injuries and ultimately, she succumbed to the injuries. Thus, death occurred because of the burns. The respondent No.1 has therefore, rightly categorized the petitioner under category 2(c).

9. We do not find any reason to interfere with the aforesaid finding, which is in tune with revised guidelines. Petition is devoid of merit and is dismissed accordingly.

[JUDGE]

[JUDGE]

Choulwar