



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

208

CRWP 9355 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:23.01.2026

Sonu

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

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

Present : Mr. Lajpat Rai Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

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 24.07.2025 (Annexure P-1) passed by respondent No.3, whereby his request for grant of parole has been declined in an arbitrary manner. A prayer has also been made to issue appropriate directions to respondent No. 3 to release the petitioner on parole for a period of five (05) weeks.
2.
- Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner stands convicted by the Court of the learned Additional

Sessions Judge, Faridabad, vide judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 04.04.2024, whereby, he has been sentenced to undergo life imprisonment under Section 302 IPC along with a fine of ₹10,000/-, and in default of payment of fine, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of six months. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has remained in judicial custody since the date of his arrest and was never granted the concession of regular bail during the entire course of trial. Learned counsel next contends that the respondent No.3 has rejected the petitioner's application for grant of parole solely on the report received from the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Crime, Sonipat.

3. 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 as the petitioner is serving sentence in a serious crime and the present petition is liable to be dismissed.

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

5. 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. 3 solely on report received from the office of the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Crime, Sonipat. However, a perusal of the impugned order does not disclose any material or basis on which respondent No. 3 arrived at a conclusion that "there is

apprehension/possibility of threat of breach of public peace because the prisoner is serving sentence for a serious crime, who may come on prole and violate the rules of release and abscond and commit other crimes”. Apart from that, it is not the case of the respondent authorities that the petitioner is otherwise ineligible for grant of parole.

6. 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.

7. All pending applications, if any, are disposed off, accordingly.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

23.01.2026

amit rana

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No