



\$~74

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 3792/2025**

ANOOP KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Anushkaa Arora
(DHCLSC) along with Mr.
Riya Goyal, Adv.

versus

STATE GNCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Bhandari,
ASC (CrI.) for the State
along with Mr. Arjit
Sharma & Ms. Sakshi Jha,
Adv.
Insp. Dharmendra Kumar,
PS Ashok Vihar.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

18.11.2025

%

1. The present petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 528 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus for directing the respondent authorities to release the petitioner on parole for a period of two months, in order to grieve the demise of his father with his family members.
2. The petitioner was convicted in FIR No. 317/2010 registered at Police Station Ashok Vihar, for the offences punishable under Sections 302/394/397/120B/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and was sentenced to rigorous imprisonment for life.
3. The application of the petitioner seeking parole was



rejected *vide* order dated 23.10.2025 by the Jail Authorities citing Rule 1210 sub-rule (II) and (IV) of the Delhi Prison Rules, 2018. Sub-rule (II) provides that the convict who has been awarded a major punishment should have shown uniformly good conduct for the last two years from the date of application in order to be eligible for parole. Further, sub-rule (IV) provides that the convict should not have violated any terms and conditions of previously granted parole or furlough.

4. It is not disputed that the petitioner when previously released on emergency parole upto 06.04.2023, did not surrender on time and absconded. He was rearrested only on 18.12.2024. Undisputedly, the petitioner has previously violated the terms of his parole and has not shown two years of good conduct from the date of arrest. The petitioner is, therefore, not entitled for being released on parole under provisions of the Delhi Prison Rules, 2018.

5. I, therefore, find no infirmity in the order passed by the respondent authority rejecting the application for parole.

6. The petition is, therefore, dismissed.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

NOVEMBER 18, 2025

“SK”