



\$~103

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 1080/2024**

SHIVAM SINGH @NANHE

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shannu Baghel, Ms.
Poonam Kavita Kashyap, Ms.
Nargish, Ms. Sunita, Ms.
Shwana Khan and Ms. Jyoti,
Advocates.

versus

SATISH GOLCHA DG PRISON

.....Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DHARMESH SHARMA

ORDER

16.07.2024

%

1. The petitioner is seeking initiation of contempt proceedings against the respondent for violation of the order dated 24.05.2024 passed by this Court.
2. None appeared on behalf of the respondent despite sending advance notice.
3. Having heard learned counsels for the petitioner, it appears that the petitioner sought a release on parole for personally attending to the medical treatment and post-treatment care of his old aged mother for a period of four weeks. This Court directed the respondent to place the representation of the petitioner before the Competent Authority and take appropriate decision within 10 days under intimation to the petitioner.
4. The grievance of the petitioner is that no decision was taken within 10 days and eventually, this Court *vide* order dated 26.06.2024,



passed the following order:-

“1. Pursuant to previous order dated 14.06.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge (Vacation Bench), status report has been filed in hard copies. The same is taken on the record.

2. Ms. Priyam Agarwal, appearing on behalf of Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel (crl) for respondent submits that the mother of the petitioner was suffering from gall stone disease for which *elective Laproscopic cholecystectomy* was done on 13.06.2024 and the mother-patient has since been discharged from the hospital on 15.06.2024. It is submitted that on inquiry, the medical condition of the patient has been found to be stable and she no longer requires any special care or attention.

3. In view of the above, the present application seeking grant of parole is rendered infructuous and the same is hereby dismissed.”

5. *Ex-facie*, there are no grounds to proceed against the respondent for alleged disobedience of the directions passed by this Court. It is manifest that the representation of the petitioner was *per se* groundless as the condition of his mother was not such that required his personal presence and indulgence for medical treatment of his mother.

6. The present petition is dismissed.

DHARMESH SHARMA, J.

JULY 16, 2024

sp