

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

2026:PHHC:015585



101

**CRWP-13248-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 03.02.2026**

Ajay Singh @ Karaj

...Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

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

Mr. Navdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J. (Oral)

Petitioner has come before this Court under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, for quashing of impugned order dated 29.09.2025 (Annexure P4) passed by respondent No.2, or to grant parole to the petitioner for eight weeks.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the observation in the impugned order regarding apprehension of peace and tranquility of the State, in case the petitioner is released on parole is mechanical in nature and is not supported by any tangible material evidence. There is no such observation made in the impugned order to suggest that conduct of the petitioner in the jail was not up to the mark and rather conduct of the petitioner as an inmate in jail has been good and peaceful. He urged that the petitioner remained in custody from 09.10.2015 till 17.12.2015 and from 29.05.2019 till 23.01.2020 and thereafter, he is in custody since 02.01.2025 and has undergone nearly two years of imprisonment in the present case and he has not been released on parole on

any earlier occasion. He submitted that the administrative authorities should have taken all the relevant facts into consideration while considering request of the petitioner for parole. He submitted that as parole of the petitioner has been rejected on flimsy grounds, so the impugned order dated 29.09.2025 passed by respondent No.2 is liable to be set aside.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel contended that the recommendation was not made for release of the petitioner on parole on the basis that there is threat to security of the State and maintenance of public order in case the petitioner is released on parole and if the petitioner is released on parole then the petitioner could indulge into drug peddling and may also abscond and as such he is not entitled to parole.

4. I have perused the order Annexure P4 whereby the prayer of the petitioner was turned down only on the basis of reproduction of the report of the concerned authority. There is no reasoning in the order dated 29.09.2025 passed by the District Magistrate.

5. Given above, present petition is allowed and order (Annexure P-4) is set aside. Respondents are directed to reconsider the claim of the petitioner for temporary release on parole and pass a reasoned order afresh in accordance with law, preferably within a period of one month from the date of receipt of this order.

6 Order so passed be communicated to the petitioner without any delay enabling him to take legal recourse, if required. Pending application(s) if any also stand disposed of.

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

03.02.2026.

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