

\$~4

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(CRL) 1779/2015**
LAXMI

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Sunita Arora, Adv. for
Mr.Krishan Kumar, Adv.

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Through: Ms.Nandita Rao, ASC for the State
with Ms. Srilina Roy, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR

ORDER
% 23.09.2015

The petitioner had applied before the competent authority for being released on parole for the purposes of finding a suitable match for her unmarried daughter as also for reconnecting social ties and spending some quality time with family and relatives outside Delhi.

The aforesaid prayer of the petitioner was rejected on 29.7.2015 by the competent authority on the ground that the conduct of the petitioner in jail was not uniformly good, rather it has been unsatisfactory. The competent authority was of the view that one of the guidelines for grant of parole/furlough is the good conduct of the convict in jail.

A look at the nominal roll suggests that canteen facilities qua the petitioner were stopped for a week vide order dated 21.2.2015.

The petitioner has not been assigned any work on medical ground.

The nominal roll also discloses that one of the co-accused, being her son, is out of jail whereas the other is in custody till date.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is 60 years old widow.

The status report filed by the State reveals that one daughter of the petitioner is still unmarried.

In the absence of the father of the daughter, the responsibility to find a suitable match falls on the mother of the daughter. The address of the petitioner has been verified and it has been found out that there are many members in the family of the petitioner.

It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that on earlier occasions when the petitioner was released on furlough/parole, no untoward incident was reported and the petitioner surrendered before the jail authorities on or before the expiry of the said period.

Thus it is argued that the opinion of the police regarding her creating law and order problem in case of her release on parole is without any basis or any credible information.

Considering the aforesaid facts, this Court is inclined to release the petitioner on parole for a specified period.

Let the petitioner be released on parole for a period of 30 days from the date of her release subject to the petitioner furnishing a bond in the sum of Rs.5,000/- with one surety of like amount, to the satisfaction of the Trial Court, subject to the condition that she shall not indulge in any unlawful activity and would surrender before the jail authorities on or before the expiry of the said period of parole.

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

SEPTEMBER 23, 2015

ns