

\$~38

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 2972/2015**

**DILSHAD**

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Harsh Prabhakar, Mr.Aditya  
Vikram and Mr.Anirudh Tanwar,  
Advocates.

versus

**STATE**

..... Respondent

Through: Ms.Nandita Rao, A.S.C. for the State  
with SI Brij Mohan, PS Welcome.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI**

**ORDER**

%

**04.02.2016**

**Crl.M.A. No.18429/2015**

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

**W.P.(CRL) 2972/2015**

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition praying for grant of parole for a period of one month on the ground of filing SLP before the Supreme Court as well as for maintaining social ties.
2. Status report has been filed by the State.
3. On behalf of State, prayer of the petitioner for grant of parole has been opposed on the ground that the petitioner has been convicted in a case of multiple murder. Learned ASC for the State has submitted that even as

*W.P.(CRL) 2972/2015*

*Page 1 of 2*

per the nominal roll, the overall jail conduct as well as the jail conduct of the petitioner during last one year is also unsatisfactory and he has been awarded punishment on 10.04.2015 for misbehaving with the doctor.

4. Clause 12.5 of Parole/Furlough Guidelines-2010 issued by Govt. of NCT of Delhi provides that :-

*'12.5 In the following cases, parole would ordinarily be not granted except, if in the discretion of the competent authority special circumstances exist for grant of parole:-*

- (a) If the prisoner is convicted of murder after rape;*
- (b) If the prisoner is convicted for murder and rape of children;*
- (c) If prisoner is convicted for multiple murders.'*

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that even in the cases of multiple murder, this Court had been granting parole to the convicts taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case.

6. Keeping in view that in this case the petitioner has been convicted in a case of multiple murder and apart from that his overall jail conduct as well as jail conduct during last one year is unsatisfactory, the prayer of the petitioner for releasing him on parole is declined at this stage.

7. Writ petition is dismissed.

8. The petitioner be informed through the concerned Jail Superintendent about the orders passed.

**PRATIBHA RANI, J.**

**FEBRUARY 04, 2016**

'st'