



2026:CGHC:7232-DB

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPCR No. 84 of 2026**

Ramlakhan Sahu S/o Balku Sahu Aged About 53 Years R/o Village Udanapur, P.S. Khandgaon, District Koriya C.G.

... Petitioner(s)**versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Home (Jail) Department, Mahanadi Bhavan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, Atal Nagar, District Raipur C.G.
2. The Jail and Correctional Services Chhattisgarh The Director General of Prisons, Jail Road, Raipur, District Raipur C.G.
3. The Jail Superintendent Central Jail, Ambikapur, District Surguja C.G.
4. The District Magistrate, District- Manendragarh-Chirmiri-Bharatpur C.G.
5. The Superintendent of Police District- Manendragarh-Chirmiri-Bharatpur C.G.

...Respondent(s)

(Cause-title taken from Case Information System)

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Ashutosh Trivedi, Advocate.
For Respondent/State	:	Mr. Priyank Rathi, Government Advocate.



Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, Judge
Order on Board

Per Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

10.02.2026

1. Heard Mr. Ashutosh Trivedi, learned counsel for the petitioner. Also heard Mr. Priyank Rathi, learned Government Advocate, appearing for the State/respondents.

2. The present writ petition has been filed by the petitioner with the following prayers:

“10.1 That, the Hon’ble Court may be kind enough to call for the entire records from the respondents pertaining to the case of the petitioner, in the ends of justice.

10.2 That, the Hon’ble Court may be kind enough to set aside the order dated 17.07.2025 (Annexure P/1) and direct the release of the petitioner on parole, in the ends of justice.

10.3 Any other relief may also be granted in favour of the petitioner as may deem fit by the Hon’ble Court as per facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been convicted by the learned Second Additional Sessions Judge,



Manendragarh, District Koriya (C.G.), vide judgment dated 27.01.2023 passed in Sessions Trial No. 32 of 2020, for offences punishable under Sections 302, 201, 120-B and 34 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC), and has been sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for different terms, including imprisonment for life. Challenging the said judgment of conviction and order of sentence, the petitioner preferred criminal appeal bearing CRA No. 797 of 2023 before this Court. This Court, vide order dated 03.11.2023, dismissed the petitioner's application for suspension of sentence and grant of bail, and the said appeal is still pending consideration.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that thereafter the petitioner submitted an application before the Jail Superintendent seeking temporary release on parole, which was duly forwarded to the District Magistrate, Manendragarh-Chirmiri-Bharatpur (C.G.). However, the District Magistrate, vide order dated 17.07.2025, rejected the said application summarily without adhering to the mandate of the Chhattisgarh Prisoner's Leave Rules, 1989 (hereinafter referred to as "the Rules of 1989"). It is contended that the said order suffers from non-application of mind and is in violation of the statutory provisions, and therefore, the same deserves to be quashed.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel opposed the submissions and submitted that the petitioner stands convicted for heinous offences, including the offence of murder punishable under Section 302 of the IPC. It is further submitted that the application for temporary release



was duly considered by the Collector-cum-District Magistrate, Manendragarh-Chirmiri-Bharatpur (C.G.), on the basis of the recommendation of the Superintendent of Police, who had specifically recorded the objection raised by the victim's family expressing grave apprehension that in the event of the petitioner being released, even temporarily, there exists a serious threat to their lives. It is also pointed out that this Court, in **WPPIL No. 33 of 2025 (In Re: Suo Motu Public Interest Litigation vs. State of Chhattisgarh & Others)**, has already expressed concern that several prisoners released on parole or short-term bail have absconded and failed to surrender before the concerned authorities, thereby creating serious law and order issues. In view of such observations and the apprehension expressed by the victim's family, it is submitted that the competent authority has rightly rejected the petitioner's application for parole and no interference is warranted.

6. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record. This Court does not find any infirmity in the impugned order dated 17.07.2025. The rejection of the petitioner's application for temporary release is based not only upon the nature and gravity of the offences for which the petitioner stands convicted, but also upon the genuine apprehension expressed by the victim's family regarding threat to their safety. Moreover, this Court, in WPPIL No. 33 of 2025, has already taken note of the increasing tendency of prisoners misusing the concession of parole and absconding, which has a direct bearing on public order and safety. In such circumstances, the competent authority was justified in exercising caution and rejecting the



petitioner's request for parole.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition, being devoid of merits, deserves to be and is hereby **dismissed**. However, the petitioner is at liberty to file an application for urgent hearing in CRA No. 797 of 2023, if so advised.

**Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge**

**Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice**