

8# \$~

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(CRL) 374/2011**

PANKAJ BISWAS

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Bhupesh Narula and Mr. Yash
Tandon, Advocates.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Harsh Prabhakar, Advocate for
Mr. Pawan Sharma, Standing
Counsel.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

%

16.11.2011

Learned counsel for the Petitioner on instructions states that the Special Leave Petition has not been filed by the Petitioner.

By this petition the Petitioner seeks parole on the ground that he has to file a Special leave Petition, engage and counsel and arrange funds therefor.

On a notice being issued a status report has been filed. As per the status report the contention of the Petitioner that he has no one to pursue his Special Leave Petition is incorrect. The family of the Petitioner comprises of his father, mother, brother and three sisters. The parents of the Petitioners and his one sister are working as painters and domestic help and are thus in a

W.P.(CRL) 374/2011

Page 1 of 2


position to engage a lawyer for the Petitioner.

Further a perusal of the nominal roll of the Petitioner shows that besides the present case the Petitioner has been convicted in two other cases one under Section 302/449/396/34 IPC and the other under Sections 394/307/34 IPC. In view of the fact that the Petitioner besides the present case, has been convicted in two other cases of serious offences, I do not find it to be a fit case to grant parole to the Petitioner.

Petitioner would be at liberty to file Special Leave Petition through the legal aid available in the jail.

Petition is dismissed.

Copy of the order be communicated to the Petitioner through Superintendent Tihar Jail.


MUKTA GUPTA, J.

NOVEMBER 16, 2011

‘vn’