



\$~19

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1552/2026**

SHREEDHAR LAXMAN RANGARI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Yugansh Mittal & Mr. Keshav
Poonia, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Bhandari, ASC
(Criminal) with Mr. Arjit Sharma
& Ms. Sakshi Jha, Advocates.
SI Neela, PS Swaroop Nagar.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

26.05.2026

1. Pursuant to the order dated 14.05.2026, Mr. Sanjeev Bhandari, learned Additional Standing Counsel, has handed over an affidavit dated 22.05.2026 affirmed by the Principal Secretary (Home), Government of the National Capital Territory of Delhi, which is taken on record. While the petitioner's application for parole refers to the filing of a Special Leave Petition before the Supreme Court and his desire to maintain social ties, it is stated in the said affidavit as follows:

"8. That, accordingly the case of said convict was processed for the decision of the competent authority only for the ground 'to maintain social ties' and inadvertently the ground for parole 'i.e. to file SLP' was left out. The mistake has been bonafide due the reason that Delhi Prisons has only mentioned the grounds for grant of parole as 'to maintain social ties' and had not mentioned the complete grounds in the check-list and the performa.



XXXX

XXXX

XXXX

XXXX

10. That it is most respectfully submitted that the convict's application mentioning both grounds i.e. to maintain social ties and to file SLP before Hon'ble Supreme Court, has now been re-submitted before the competent authority for consideration along with mentioning the orders of this Hon'ble Court in the similar matters, wherein this Hon'ble Court has allowed parole for filing the SLP, considering filing of SLP as 'Special Circumstances'."

2. Mr. Bhandari, learned Additional Standing Counsel, submits that the decision of the competent authority, upon reconsideration of the petitioner's case, shall be communicated to the petitioner within three weeks from today.
3. In view of the aforesaid submission, Mr. Yugansh Mittal, learned counsel for the petitioner, does not seek any further orders in the present writ petition, while reserving the petitioner's right to avail appropriate remedies in accordance with law in the event of an adverse order.
4. The writ petition is, accordingly, disposed of in terms of the above.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

MAY 26, 2026
'pv'/SD/