

\$~45

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(CRL) 2034/2015**
TIKAM SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Aditya Vikram, Adv.

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, ASC for the State
SI Dinesh Dahiya, PS Sultanpuri

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR

ORDER

%

16.09.2015

The petitioner questions the order dated 29.7.2015 passed by the competent authority whereby his prayer for being released on parole for the purposes of providing adequate medical treatment to his ailing wife as also for re-establishing social ties has been rejected. The ground for rejection, it is argued, is not a cogent one.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits with reference to the nominal roll that he has remained in custody for about 8 years by now and his overall conduct in jail has been satisfactory.

Mr. Sanjay Lao, Additional Standing counsel files the status report during the course of hearing of this petition.

Let it be taken on record.

The status report affirms the address of the petitioner as also the fact that his wife is suffering from illness.

Considering the above mentioned 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 his 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 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.

Dasti.

ASHUTOSH KUMAR, J

SEPTEMBER 16, 2015

ns