

\$~81

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 33/2020**

GAURAV

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Kunal Malhotra, Advocate for
DHCLSC.

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Rahul Mehra and Mr. Jamal
Akhtar, Standing Counsel for the
State with SI Ram Kishan PS Maurya
Enclave.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJNISH BHATNAGAR

ORDER

% **08.01.2020**

Crl. M.A. No.151/2020 (for exemption)

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(CRL) 33/2020

1. By of this petition, the petitioner is seeking parole for a period of two months, and has challenged the impugned order dated 29.8.2019, by virtue of which his prayer for parole was dismissed by the competent authority. The ground for seeking parole is that petitioner wants to maintain social ties and family relations. Legal Aid counsel prayed that parole be granted to the petitioner. On the other hand, learned APP for the State has submitted that the conduct of the petitioner does not entitle him for release of parole as there is

bar of Rule 1210 sub rule (II) of Delhi Prison Rules 2018, and petitioner cannot be released on parole as his conduct has been unsatisfactory. Rule 1210 Sub Rule (II) of Delhi Prison Rules, 2018 reads as under:-

“ The conduct of the prison who has been awarded major punishment for any prison offence should have been uniformly good for last two years from the date of application and the conduct of prisoner who has been awarded minor punishment or no punishment for any prison offence in prison should have been uniformly good for last one year from the date of application .”

2. I have perused the nominal roll. As per the nominal roll, the jail conduct of the petitioner is unsatisfactory and he has also been punished on 16.5.2019 and 19.7.2019. In view of the nominal roll and Rule 1210 Sub Rule (II) of Delhi Prison Rules, referred to hereinabove, petitioner is not entitled to grant of parole.

3. Dismissed.

RAJNISH BHATNAGAR, J

JANUARY 08, 2020/ib