



\$~12

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(CRL) 2937/2025

RAJ KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shannu Baghel, Mr.
Ganpat Ram, Mr. Aakash,
Mr. Saksham Kumar &
Ms. Sonam Tomar, Advs.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Yasir Rauf Ansari,
ASC for the State with Mr.
Alok Sharma, Adv.
Inspector Abhijeet Singh,
PS- Geeta Colony
Mr. Sanjeev Sharma,
Deputy Secretary (Home)
- (through VC)
Mr. Chandra,
Superintendent, CJ-14

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

16.12.2025

CRL.M.A. 33975/2025 (for restoration of the petition) in
W.P.(CRL) 2937/2025

1. The writ petition, was filed by the petitioner seeking a writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, directing the respondent to release the petitioner on parole for a period of 4 weeks for re-establishing family and social ties.
2. The Coordinate Bench of this Court *vide* order dated 28.10.2025 has disposed of the writ petition filed by the petitioner and had directed the respondent authorities to decide the petitioner's prayer for release on parole within a period of one week from that date.
3. *Vide* Order dated 02.12.2025, this Court had recorded that



the application filed by the petitioner seeking parole has not been decided till date and *prima facie* the respondent authorities are in contempt of the order passed by this Court.

4. Addressing the reasons for delay, the Reply has been filed by the concerned Jail Superintendent.

5. A perusal of the same indicates that there has been procedural delays and lapses on part of the Respondent authorities.

6. The delays and lapses may not appear to be deliberate, however, the same are clearly in violation of the Delhi Prison Rules as well as the directions passed by this Court. However, one last opportunity is granted to the respondent authorities to take a decision on the petitioner's application within a period of one week.

7. It is made clear that if the application is not decided within a period of one week, a cost of ₹50,000/- shall be imposed on the respondent authorities, to be deposited with the Delhi High Court Legal Services Committee.

8. The respondent authorities would be at liberty to recover the cost from the erring Officer.

9. This order shall not be taken as an opinion of the Court that the petitioner is entitled for parole. The application shall be decided as per law and applicable rules.

10. The application is disposed of with the aforesaid observations.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

DECEMBER 16, 2025

"SS"