

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-1584-2026

JUDGEMENT RESERVED ON	JUDGEMENT PRONOUNCED ON	OPERATIVE PART PRO- NOUNCED OR FULL	UPLOADED ON
27.02.2026	10.03.2026	FULL PRO- NOUNCED	11.03.2026

Mohd. Sanjay alias Jaggu

....Petitioner

Vs.

State of U.T. Chandigarh and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Ujwal Anand, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Varun Baanth, Addl. P.P., U.T. Chandigarh with
Mr. Akash Shoni, Advocate and
Mr. Sahil Lohan, Advocate
for the respondent-U.T.

ANOOP CHITKARA J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
211	16.08.2021	Sector 39, Chandi- garh	379-A, 411 IPC

1. Aggrieved by the rejection of parole vide order dated 16.01.2026 passed by the Inspector General, Prisons, UT Chandigarh, the petitioner who has been convicted in the FIR captioned above, had come up before this Court by filing the present criminal writ petition.
2. On 12.02.2026, a Coordinate Bench of this Court had passed a detailed order, in which it was explicitly mentioned in Sr.No. 2 of the table of para iv, that as per verification, the family of convict is found residing at the given address i.e. #1913 Vikas Nagar, Mauli Jagran, Chd., which was meticulously verified. However, in para 7 of the said order, Coordinate Bench had directed the respondent to conduct verification again and as per para 8, a fresh report was directed to be submitted to this Court by the next date.
3. On 27.02.2026, when the matter was listed, no compliance report has been filed,

however the State counsel on instructions submits that mother of the petitioner is residing at the given address. The only conclusion this Court can draw is that earlier address of the petitioner was not properly verified, as such, address given by the convict where he supposed to reside, is correct.

4. Thus, in the entirety of facts and circumstances, the impugned order dated 16.01.2026 passed by the Inspector General of Prisons, U.T. Chandigarh, is quashed and set aside. If the petitioner has not been released on parole then the fresh exercise be taken and completed on or before 25.03.2026, and the order passed be communicated not only to the petitioner but also to Mr. Ujwal Anand, Advocate for the petitioner. It is clarified that if compliance is not made to this Court it shall be permissible for the petitioner to file application for contempt of Court against the Inspector General of Prisons, Chandigarh and other people who are found sitting over the matter.

5. Registry to send a copy of this order to counsel for U.T., for compliance. However it is clarified that if the petitioner has already been released on parole, then there shall be no need to comply with the directions as mentioned above. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

10.03.2026

Anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes

Whether reportable: No.