



\$~104

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1147/2026 & CRL.M.A. 10944/2026**

LAL MOHAMMAD

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pratap Singh, Advocate
(DHCLSC)

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Rahul Tyagi, ASC (Crl.) for the
State with Mr. Sangeet Sibon,
Mr. Aniket Kumar Singh,
Mr. Priyansh Raj Singh, Advocates
with SI Mukul, PS Keshav Puram.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER

09.04.2026

%

1. Petitioner seeks direction to respondent to release him on parole for a period of two weeks.
2. Petitioner faced a trial for attempted murder and was found guilty.
3. He was, eventually, sentenced for rigorous imprisonment for four years and fine of Rs.5,000/- for offence under Section 307 IPC and rigorous imprisonment for three years and fine of Rs.5,000/- for offences under Sections 25/27 Arms Act, 1959. There was also provision for in-default imprisonment and both the sentences were directed to run concurrently.
4. His appeal has already been dismissed by this Court on 05.09.2024.
5. It is, however, not very clear whether any SLP was filed by him or not.
6. Be that as it may, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the unexpired portion of sentence is hardly of 3 months and 26 days. He states



that his conduct is satisfactory as would be evident from Nominal Roll and, moreover, he was granted parole, lastly, from 18.12.2025 to 01.01.2026 for a period of two weeks.

7. The prime most reason assigned is that the marriage of the daughter of the petitioner is scheduled for 12.04.2026 and being father, his presence is imperative and, therefore, he sought parole by filing appropriate application on 01.04.2026. Such application has though been forwarded to the concerned *Competent Authority* on 06.04.2026, there is no decision, as yet.

8. Ideally speaking, if the marriage had been scheduled for 12.04.2026, the petitioner herein should have made any such request or application, well in time.

9. Sh. Rahul Tyagi, learned Additional Standing Counsel (Crl.) appears on advance notice and, on instructions, submits that the factum of the marriage has been verified from the close relatives and neighbours of the petitioner. He, in all fairness, submits that since the unexpired period of sentence is very less, he would leave it to the discretion of this Court to pass appropriate order. He, however, does admit that as per Nominal Roll also, the conduct of the petitioner was found satisfactory and he has been given benefit of parole on previous two occasions and there is no instance of its misuse and he surrendered after expiry of the period of parole.

10. Keeping in mind the overall facts of the case and, in particular, the fact that the unexpired portion of the sentence is relatively insignificant and the fact that participation of the petitioner, being father, in the marriage of his daughter is essential, his request is acceded to and the petitioner is directed to be released on parole for a period of two weeks to be reckoned from the date of his release, subject to the following conditions:-



- (i) The petitioner shall furnish personal bond in a sum of Rs.10,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the Jail Superintendent.
- (ii) Immediately upon the expiry of period of parole, the petitioner shall surrender before the Jail Superintendent.
- (iii) The period of parole shall be counted from the day, the petitioner is released from jail.
11. Petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.
12. A copy of this order be sent to Jail Superintendent for information and compliance.
13. A copy of this order be given *dasti* under the signatures of Court Master.
14. Pending application also stands disposed of.

MANOJ JAIN, J

APRIL 9, 2026

st/js