

3

\$~9 & 10

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1619/2016 & CRL.M.A. 8441/2016**

SHYAM PAL

..... Petitioner

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

..... Respondent

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1630/2016 & CRL.M.A. 8501/2016**

SHYAM PAL

..... Petitioner

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

..... Respondent

Through: Mr Jayant K. Sud, Mr Honey Khanna and
Ms Vaishali Soni, Advocates for the
petitioner.
Mr Ashish Aggarwal, Addl. Standing
Counsel (Crl.) for State.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SIDDHARTH MRIDUL

ORDER

%

31.05.2016

The present petitions under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 inter alia seek a direction to the competent authority to expeditiously decide the representation for parole filed by the petitioner.

Mr Ashish Aggarwal, learned Additional Standing Counsel (Crl.) appearing on behalf of the State, states that although upon verification it has been ascertained that no such representation seeking parole filed by the petitioner is pending before the competent authority, the competent authority will treat the present petition as a representation and dispose it of in accordance with law, within a period of ten working days from today, under intimation to

the petitioner.

Directed accordingly.

With the above direction the writ petition is disposed of reserving liberty to the petitioner to approach this court in the event the representation for parole, as above, is not considered favourably.

A copy of this order be given *dasti* under signature of Court Master to counsel for the parties.

MAY 31, 2016

mk ✓


SIDDHARTH MRIDUL, J