



\$~121

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(CRL) 3993/2025, CRL.M.A. 35935/2025 stay
RAVINDERPetitioner

Through: Mr. Siddharth Yadav and Mr. Nitin
Kumar Yadav, Advs.

Versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Bhandari, ASC for the
State with SI Kailash, PS R. K. Puram

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **03.12.2025**

1. The present petition has been filed seeking the following reliefs:-

- a) *Issue a writ in the nature of Mandamus issuance of directions to the respondent to stop his transfer from the Jail No.2, Tihar Jail to Jail No.14, Mandoli in FIR NO. 169/2012, U/S 302 IPC & 25/27 ARMS ACT, P.S. R.K. PURAM;*
- b) *Pass such further order(s) as this Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper.*

2. Mr. Siddharth Yadav, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been released on furlough for a period of three weeks in case FIR No. 169/2012 under Section 302 IPC and under Sections 25/27 of the Arms Act, P.S. R. K. Puram, and his schedule date of surrender is 09.12.2025.

3. He submits that the petitioner has come to know that he is being transferred from Jail No.2, Tihar Jail to Jail No.14, Mandoli. He contend that *vide* order dated 11.06.2025 (Annexure-P1), the petitioner has already been identified as one of the convict for being lodged in Semi Open Jail.



4. He refers to Rule 664(8) of the Delhi Prison Rule, 2018 (hereinafter the 'Rules') to contend that the prisoners may be transferred from one prison to another, *inter alia*, for the reason that is, '*to be nearer to his home district*'. He submits that the petitioner is resident of R. K. Puram which is close to Tihar Jail whereas, he is being transferred from Tihar to Mandoli.
5. The petition, is however, opposed by Mr. Sanjeev Bhandari, learned Additional Standing Counsel. He submits that the petition is not maintainable. He further contends that Rule 664(8) of the Rules does not furnish any right to the petitioner, rather it is discretion of the authorities to transfer the prisoners in accordance with the guidelines mentioned therein.
6. He further submits that an administrative decision has been taken to transfer around 26 prisoners, and the petitioner is not the only one.
7. At this stage, Mr. Yadav submits that he does not wish to press the present petition any further, if this writ petition is treated as a representation by the respondent and a decision is taken in a time bound manner.
8. In view of the limited prayer made by Mr. Yadav, the present petition is disposed of with the direction to the respondent to treat the present petition as representation and dispose of the same within a period of one week.
9. It is clarified that this Court has not examined the petition on merits.
10. Copy of this order be sent to the Jail Superintendent for compliance.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

DECEMBER 3, 2025/rr