



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

235

CRWP 5757 of 2025
Date of Decision:09.02.2026

Honey Sehgal @ Hunny Sehgal ...Petitioner
Vs.
State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present : Mr. R.S. Waraich, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Charanpreet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for quashing the order dated 21.04.2025 (Annexure P-1) passed by respondent No.2, whereby his application for releasing him on parole has been dismissed. A prayer has also been made to direct the respondents to release the petitioner on parole for a period of eight weeks so that he may rejoin the society and take care of his family members.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been behind bars since the date of conviction and has undergone more than two years of actual sentence. Learned counsel

next contends that petitioner shall maintain public peace and order while on parole and shall also strictly abide by all the terms and conditions imposed by the authorities. The petitioner's request for parole has been wrongly rejected on the basis of an adverse report submitted by respondent No.4 on the ground that the petitioner if released on parole may indulge in selling drugs and disturb local peace.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that there is no infirmity or illegality in the impugned order and that the petitioner, if released on parole, may disturb public order and may also engage in drug trafficking and the present petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

6. Sections 3 and 4 of the Punjab Good Conduct Prisoners (Temporary Release) Act, 1962 provide for the temporary release of eligible inmates (such as parole or furlough) for specific reasons, including family illness, death, or natural calamity, subject to good conduct. Section 3 provides for the grounds on which release may be granted, while Section 4 provides for the conditions, disqualifications, and safeguards, including potential denial if release poses a threat to state security.

7. In the instant case, the prayer made by the petitioner for temporary release on parole for a period of eight weeks was declined

by respondent No. 2 solely on report received from the office of the the Additional Deputy Commissioner of Police-3, Ludhaina However, a perusal of the impugned order does not disclose any material or basis on which respondent No. 2 arrived at a conclusion that “if released on parole, the prisoner may do the work of selling drugs after getting parole and local peace can be disturbed.” Apart from that, it is not the case of the respondent authorities that the petitioner is otherwise ineligible for grant of parole.

8. In view of the above discussion, this Court is of the considered opinion that the impugned order is not sustainable in the eyes of law. Accordingly, the present petition is partly allowed and the impugned order is hereby set aside. The respondents are directed to release the petitioner on temporary parole for a period of four weeks from the date of his release from jail, subject to his furnishing sufficient bonds in terms of the statutory provisions to the satisfaction of the competent authority, which shall also impose such conditions as may be deemed necessary to ensure that the temporary release is not misused. The petitioner shall undertake to maintain peace and good behaviour during the parole period and shall surrender back to jail immediately upon expiry of the parole period.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking
Whether reportable

09.02.2026
amit rana

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

Yes/No
Yes/No