

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

108

CRWP No.179 OF 2017

DATE OF DECISION : 28th FEBRUARY, 2017

Amit

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & others

.... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. B. CHAUDHARI

* * * *

Present : Mr. Ajay Gautam, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG, Haryana.

* * * *

A. B. CHAUDHARI, J. (ORAL)

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

Learned State counsel has filed affidavit of Anil Kumar, Dy. Superintendent, District Jail, Jhajjar coupled with Annexure R-II report by the SHO, Police Station, Aman Vihar, Delhi. I quote the relevant portion from his report, which reads thus:

- “1. The documents submitted by the convict verified by the concerned Hospital and found genuine.
2. The mother of the convict is residing alongwith his wife at the given address. The sister of the convict namely Sangeeta is also residing with his wife. The son of Sangeeta namely Saurabh age about 19 years is also residing with his wife. All are care taking his wife. Only sister of convict is residing at the given address and used to reside on temporary basis only and having no permanent address. If was released on parole, he could jump the parole.

3. He is such a desperate criminal and public tranquility will be disturbed due to his presence in the society. Hence, he may not be released on parole in favour of public interest.”

Learned State counsel submits that the petitioner is facing two more cases.

In ordinary course this court would have extended the benefit of parole to the petitioner. However, I find from the report that mother and sister of the convict are taking care of his wife in the matter of pre-delivery and would be taking care post-delivery.

In that view of the matter, I think they are the only persons who are necessary, rather than the petitioner. At a later point of time the petitioner can ask for the relief but not at this stage, since his mother and sister are taking care of his wife.

In the result the petition for parole is dismissed.

28th February, 2017
‘raj’

(A. B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes	No
Whether Reportable:	Yes	No.