

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
WRIT PETITION (CRL.) NO(s). 40 OF 2009

PEHLAD SINGH

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

WITH W.P(CRL.) No. 92 of 2009

(With office report)

W.P(CRL.) No. 96 of 2009

(With office report)

W.P(CRL.) No. 99 of 2009

(With appln. for stay of arrest and office report)

W.P(CRL.) No. 112 of 2009

(With office report)

W.P(CRL.) No. 11 of 2009

Date: 20/04/2010 These Petitions were mentioned today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V.S. SIRPURKAR

HON'BLE Dr. JUSTICE MUKUNDAKAM SHARMA

For Petitioner(s) Mr. B.S.Malik, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Sanjay Sharawat, Adv.
Mr. Chander Shekhar Ashri, Adv.
Ms. Santosh Singh, Adv.
Mr. S.N.Thakur, Adv.

Mrs. Santosh Singh, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Manjit Singh, Adv. for
Mr. Kamal Mohan Gupta, Adv.

Mr. Avijit Bhattacharjee, Adv.
Mr. Bikas Kar Gupta, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

W.P.(Crl.) Nos. 40/2009, 96/2009 and 112/2009:

The writ petitions stand disposed of in terms of the signed order.

W.P.(Crl.) No. 11 of 2010:

List the matter after the service is complete. Dasti, in addition, is permitted.

-2-

W.P.(Crl.) No. 92 of 2009:

The writ petition is dismissed in terms of the signed order.

W.P. (Crl.) No. 99 of 2009 :

List after two weeks.

(Shashi Sareen)
Court Master

(Shashi Bala Vij)
Court Master

(signed order in W.P. (Crl.) Nos. 40/2009, 96/2009 and 112/2009 is placed on the file and signed order in W.P. (Crl.) No. 92/2009 has been sent for signatures of His Lordships)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION (CRL.) No. 40 OF 2009

PEHLAD SINGH ... Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS. ... Respondent(s)

with

W.P.(Crl.) Nos. 96/2009, 112/2009

O R D E R

1. It is stated by Mr. Manjit Singh, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State of Haryana that petitioners namely; Pehlad Singh in W.P.(Crl.) No. 40 of 2009, Joginder @ Rajinder in W.P.(Crl.) No. 96 of 2009 and Kiran Anmol Singh in W.P.(Crl.) No. 112 of 2009 have already undergone 20 years of actual imprisonment. According to Mr. Manjit Singh, these petitions are covered by the judgment passed by this court in State of Haryana and Ors. Vs. Jagdish JT 2010 (3) SC 341.

2. Mr. Manjit Singh, learned counsel fairly states that it is the prevalent policy at the time of conviction which has been held to be the proper policy as per the aforesaid judgment.

-2-

3. Accordingly, the petitioners namely; Pehlad Singh, Joginer @ Rajinder and Kiran Anmol Singh are directed to be released from custody forthwith, if not required in any other case.

4. The writ petitions stand disposed of accordingly.

.....J.
(V.S.SIRPURKAR)

.....J.
(Dr. MUKUNDAKAM SHARMA)

New Delhi,
April 20, 2010.