

\$~40

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

+ W.P.(CRL) 1766/2015

LATOOR SINGH Petitioner

Through: Mr.Jatin Rajput and Mr.Anupam
Dubey, Advs.

versus

STATE Respondent

Through: Mr.Vishesh Wadhwa, proxy for
Mr.R.S. Kundu, ASC for the State

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR

ORDER

% **18.08.2015**

The petitioner contends that he is required to file SLP before the Supreme Court of India against the judgment and order of conviction passed by the High Court in Crl. A. No.10/2000. For that purpose, he preferred an application before the competent authority for his release on parole. The same has been rejected.

Hence, this petition.

The petitioner has remained in custody for six years by now. The nominal roll suggests that his overall conduct in jail is satisfactory.

The petitioner cannot be prevented from availing his legal remedies even though he has been convicted and in appeal the judgment and order of conviction has been upheld.

The status report which has been filed today in Court affirms the address of the petitioner which has been given by him in his petition.

Considering the aforesaid facts, the petitioner is directed to be released on parole for a period of 30 days from the date of his release subject to the petitioner furnishing a bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- with one surety of like amount to the satisfaction of the Trial Court, subject to the following conditions:-

- a) The petitioner shall surrender before the jail authorities on or before the expiry of the said period of parole.
- b) The petitioner shall not engage himself in any unlawful activity.
- c) If the petitioner is required to go out of the territory of Delhi, he would intimate about his visit to the SHO of the concerned police station.
- d) He shall furnish his mobile telephone number and the mobile telephone number of the surety to the SHO of the concerned police station so that in case of necessity he could be tracked and his whereabouts could be ascertained.

In case, the petitioner flouts any one of the conditions, an application could be moved by the SHO for cancellation of his parole and for taking of the coercive steps for securing his attendance.

With these observations, the petition is disposed of.

A copy of this order be communicated to the Superintendent of the concerned Jail for information and compliance.

ASHUTOSH KUMAR, J

AUGUST 18, 2015/ns