



LPA-906-2026

1

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

(136)

LPA-906-2026

Date of Decision : April 06, 2026

Deepak Sharma

.. Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.. Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Mr. Brijender Kaushik, Advocate, for the appellant.

Ms. Anu Pal, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

1. In the present Letters Patent Appeal, the challenge is to the order dated 24.02.2026 passed by the learned Single Judge in CRWP No. 42 of 2026, whereby the claim raised by the petitioner (appellant herein) was disposed of on the basis of the statement made by the learned State counsel.
2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the claim raised by the appellant was for grant of parole, which has not been dealt with by the learned Single Judge.
3. We have heard learned counsel for the appellant and have gone through the record with his able assistance.
4. The order dated 24.02.2026 passed by the learned Single Judge is as under:-

“ The prayer in the present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is for the quashing of the order dated 30.12.2025 passed by respondent No.2 and for issuance of appropriate directions to the respondents for releasing the petitioner on emergency parole due to the death of his father

**LPA-906-2026****2**

on 22.12.2025.

The learned counsel for the State submits that the petitioner was sent in custody for performing the last rites of his father.

In view of the above, no further orders are required to be passed by this Court.

Disposed of.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.”

5. A bare perusal of the above would show that though the learned counsel for the appellant, who is also appearing in appeal, had argued before the learned Single Judge in the criminal writ petition but no prayer for the grant of parole was raised, which clearly depicts that the said CRWP was only pressed for allowing the appellant to perform the last rites of the father for which, necessary formalities were completed.

6. Now, on the other hand, learned counsel for the appellant submits that his claim for parole was not decided.

7. Once, the said issue was not raised for the consideration of the Court, the question of deciding the same does not arise. Hence, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

8. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

April 06, 2026

harsha

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No