

47# \$~

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 517/2018**

RAJU @ NEPALI @ BHIM SAIN

..... Petitioner

Represented by: **Mr. Kumar Vaibhav, Advocate.**

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Represented by: **Mr. Sanjay Lao, Additional
Standing Counsel for State with
SI Ranbir Singh, PS Nangloi.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

%

19.02.2018

1. Issue notice.
2. Learned Additional Standing Counsel for the State accepts notice.
3. By this petition the petitioner challenges the communication dated 8th November, 2017 by the Deputy Secretary, Home conveying the rejection of the application seeking parole on the ground “to maintain social ties and relations and to curb inner stress and depression”. The reason for rejection was that two weeks’ furlough had already been granted to the convict which was yet to be availed.
4. A perusal of the nominal roll of the petitioner reveals that in the year 2017 he was granted four weeks’ parole by this Court w.e.f. 2nd January, 2017 followed by three furloughs w.e.f. 22nd May, 2017, 11th October, 2017 and 28th December, 2017.

W.P.(CRL) 517/2018

Page 1 of 2

5. Since by availing the furlough also the petitioner was able to maintain social ties and curbed any stress and depression, no ground for grant of further parole is made out.
6. Learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon the decision of this Court in case of a co-convict wherein parole has been granted by this Court. The reason for grant of parole to Ranjit Kaur in W.P. (Crl.) No. 2941/2017 was that she was required to be treated medically. Further learned counsel for the petitioner is not even aware whether Ranjit Kaur was granted furlough or not during the relevant period. Thus the petitioner cannot claim parity with Ms. Ranjit Kaur.
7. Petition is dismissed.
8. Copy of the order be communicated to the petitioner through Superintendent, Mandoli Jail.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

FEBRUARY 19, 2018
‘vn’