

INDERJIT SINGH ALAIS INDIA

....Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAURPresent: Ms. Dimple Rani, Advocate for
Mr. Kuldeep Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Pooja Nayar Sharma, DAG, Punjab (through video conferencing).

ANOOP CHITKARA, J. (Oral)

1. Aggrieved by the denial of the parole vide order dated 10.11.2025 passed by respondent No.2, petitioner has come up before this Court under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India challenging the said order.
2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent No.2 rejected the claim of the petitioner for grant of parole without any proper reasoning and prays for quashing of the same.
3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that in case, the parole is granted, they undertake not to contact the victim and not to enter the property of the victim or meet their family members during the entire period of parole.
4. On the other hand, counsel for the State opposes the prayer and submits that the order passed by the concerned authority is reasoned one and prays for dismissal of the petition.
5. We have gone through the reply dated 20.12.2025 filed by the State and paragraph No.5 of the same is extracted below:-

“5. It is submitted that the content of Para no.5, are admitted as a matter of record. The same has not been recommended by the District Magistrate, Gurdaspur.vide their office letter no.59/reader dated 08/01/2025 on the following the two reasons:-

- $$XX \qquad \qquad \qquad XX \qquad \qquad \qquad XX \qquad \qquad \qquad XX''$$

6. Petition is disposed of with the aforesaid observations. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

Sangeeta

Yes/No