



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

WRIT PETITION NO. 1030 OF 2026 (GM-POLICE)

BETWEEN:

RAMU

S/O KAMBAIAH,

AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS,

R/AT 1ST CROSS, TELEPHONE LAYOUT,

SRINIVAS NAGAR, PIPELINE,

SUNKADAKATTE, BENGALURU - 560 091.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. MANJUNATHA RAO LOKANDE N, ADVOCATE)

Digitally signed
by
SHARADAVANI
B
Location: High
Court of
Karnataka

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
HOME DEPARTMENT, VIDHAN SOUDHA,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT,
BENGALURU - 560 001.



3. THE CHIEF SUPERINTENDENT
CENTRAL PRISON, PARAPPANA AGARAHARA,
BENGALURU - 560 100.
4. THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE
AND INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE
KARNATAKA PRISON CORRECTIONAL SERVICES,
SHESHADRI ROAD, BENGALURU - 560 009.
5. STATE OF KARNATAKA
KAMAKSHIPALYA POLICE
BENGALURU - 560 079.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. K.P. YOGANNA, AGA)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO A) ISSUE WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND DIRECT THE 3RD RESPONDENT TO RELEASE THE PETITIONER ON GENERAL PAROLE FOR 90 DAYS (CONSIDERING PRODUCED VIDE ANNEXURE-D) TO THE WRIT PETITION AND ETC.,

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM



ORAL ORDER

The captioned writ petition is filed seeking a direction to respondent No.3 to release the petitioner on general parole for a period of 90 days.

2. Learned Additional Government Advocate, on perusal of the writ papers, submits that the petitioner has approached this Court without first availing the statutory remedy of submitting an application for parole before the competent jail authorities, as contemplated under the relevant prison rules.

3. Having considered the submissions and examined the material placed on record, this Court finds merit in the objection raised by the learned Additional Government Advocate. The petitioner has not exhausted the efficacious alternative remedy available under the statutory framework. In the absence of any application made before the competent authority, the present writ petition is clearly premature and not maintainable.



4. It is well settled that the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is not to be invoked in the first instance, particularly when the statute provides a specific mechanism for redressal of the grievance. Entertaining such petitions would amount to bypassing the prescribed procedure and render the statutory scheme nugatory.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition stands ***dismissed*** as premature. However, liberty is reserved to the petitioner to approach the competent jail authorities by submitting an appropriate application seeking grant of general parole, in accordance with law.

**Sd/-
(SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM)
JUDGE**