



\$~SB-21

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

+ W.P.(CRL) 1785/2026

KRISHNA DEVI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Siddarth Yadav and Mr. Anmol
Kumar Pandey, Advocates.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Priyam Agrawal and Mr.
Abhinav Arya, Advocates for Mr.
Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel for
State.
Insp. Devinder Kumar, PS Khyala.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA

ORDER

%

15.06.2026

1. This is a Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking quashing of the order dated 21.05.2026 passed by the Respondent.
2. The learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that the only ground for rejecting the application for grant of parole was in view of Rule 1212 of the Delhi Prison Rules, 2018 ("**Rules**"), which stipulates that there should be one month gap between the parole and last furlough availed and *vice-versa*.
3. The learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that Rule 1212 of the Rules provides that there should be a gap of one month between the grant of parole and last furlough availed, and not the application seeking grant of parole. He further submits that the gap contemplated in Rule 1212 of the



Rules is not mandatory and in case of medical exigency, there is no strict timeline to be applied for grant of parole even though the furlough has been granted within a period of one month.

4. The learned Counsel for the Respondent has handed over Status Report dated 13.06.2026 in the Court. The same is taken on record.

5. As per the said Status Report, the Petitioner had surrendered on 21.04.2026 and adequate opportunity and sufficient concession had been extended to the Petitioner immediately after her surgery for recovery from the operation.

6. Having considered that the time period between the last furlough and request of parole is now more than one month, it is directed that the present Petition shall be considered as an application for grant of parole before the Respondent. The Respondent shall take appropriate steps to consider the request for grant of parole in accordance with law and process the same as expeditiously as possible and ensure that the decision on this application is made within a period of two weeks from today.

7. With the aforesaid direction, the present Petition is disposed of.

8. It is further clarified that if the order is not passed by the Respondent within the time-frame, as directed above, the Petitioner is at liberty to revive the present Petition.

TEJAS KARIA, J
(VACATION JUDGE)

JUNE 15, 2026/sms