

\$~25.

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 780/2016**

RAVINDER KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rohan Kothari and Mohd. Faraz,
Advocates

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Kamna Vohra, ASC with SI
Karamvir, PS Narela

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIPIN SANGHI

ORDER
23.12.2016

%

Crl. M.A. No.20221/2016

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions. The application stands disposed of.

Crl. M.A. No.20220/2016

By this application, the petitioner seeks extension of parole. I may observe that the petitioner was directed to be released on parole vide order dated 09.03.2016. The petitioner availed of the parole on 02.11.2016. The parole was granted for a period of four weeks on the ground that the petitioner wishes to prefer a Special Leave Petition.

The petitioner did not prefer a Special Leave Petition during the period of his parole and sought extension of time by moving CrI. M.A. No. 18569/2016. The ground taken by the petitioner was that he has to withdraw money from his GPF account to pay fee of the counsel for filing the Special Leave Petition. By a detailed order dated 29.11.2016, the application was allowed and the parole was extended for a period of four weeks from 02.12.2016 on the same terms and conditions as earlier imposed. A direction was also issued to the delhi police to ensure that the GPF amount due to the petitioner with interest is released.

Once again the petitioner seeks extension of parole on the ground that the fee demanded by the counsel is more than his GPF amount, and that he has to collect some evidence from Mumbai.

It appears to this court that the petitioner is seeking to abuse the process of the court by repeatedly seeking extension. The petitioner would have known the fee that the lawyer engaged by him was quoting. Yet, he claims to have engaged the counsel whose fee is more than what he could afford by liquidating the GPF account. The petitioner could well prefer a Special Leave Petition by engaging a counsel from legal aid, or could have engaged another counsel demanding lesser amount of fee. The petitioner has had sufficient time to collect whatever documents he desired to. Accordingly, I find no merit in the present application. Dismissed.

VIPIN SANGHI, J

DECEMBER 23, 2016

sr