



\$~50

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1399/2025**

SONU SONKAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Arpit Batra &
Mr. Abhishek Thakur,
Advs.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Rupali Bandhopadhy,
ASC for the State with Mr.
Abhijeet Kumar, Adv.
SI Sargam, PS- Adarsh
Nagar

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **30.04.2025**

CRL.M.A. 13025/2025 (for exemption)

1. Exemptions allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(CRL) 1399/2025

3. The present petition is filed seeking furlough for a period of three weeks.
4. The application filed by the petitioner seeking furlough was rejected by the respondent authorities noting that the petitioner was released by the order of Sentence Reviewing Board on 11.09.2019 but was re-arrested in another case being FIR No. 539/2021 under Sections 307/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC'). It was noted that the petitioner had violated the terms and conditions of premature release.
5. The petitioner was re-arrested on 01.03.2023.



6. The benefit of furlough is granted to the convicts on their satisfying the terms and conditions as specified in Delhi Prison Rules, 2018. Rule 1223(i) of the Delhi Prison Rules, 2018 states that the convict shall not be entitled to be released on furlough unless he shows good conduct in the prison and should have earned rewards in the last three annual Good Conduct Report and continues to maintain the same.

7. The nominal roll has been handed over by the learned Additional Standing Counsel. It is pointed out that pursuant to his release by the order of Sentence Reviewing Board, the petitioner was not involved in not one but three more cases being FIR Nos. 423/2020, 539/2021 and 443/2021.

8. The petitioner has, thus, concededly violated the terms and conditions of premature release due to which, his premature release order was cancelled by the order dated 24.09.2022 of the Hon'ble the Lieutenant Governor.

9. The petitioner appears to have been re-arrested and is in custody since 01.03.2023 serving his remaining sentence.

10. Pursuant to his re-arrest on 01.03.2023, three years have not elapsed and, thus, he has not earned rewards in last three annual Good Conduct Reports in order to be eligible to apply for furlough again.

11. In view of the above, I find no merit in the present petition.

12. The petition is, therefore, dismissed.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

APRIL 30, 2025

"SS"