



2025:DHC:4534



§~59

\*

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

%

*Date of Decision: 28.05.2025*

+

**W.P.(CRL) 1813/2025****RAJENDER @ KALLU**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Chetan Bhardwaj, Ms. Priyal Bhardwaj, Mr. Pulkit Tripathi and Mr. Dhanush Kumar, Advocates.

versus

**THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anand V. Khatri, ASC for State with Inspector Ravi Kumar, PS Maurya Enclave.

**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA****J U D G M E N T (ORAL)**

1. The petitioner seeks emergency parole for four weeks.
2. At the outset, learned ASC appearing on advance intimation submits that the petitioner has concealed one of the earlier similar petitions. It is submitted by the ASC that this is the third petition on the same cause of action. It is disclosed by learned ASC that initially, for the same relief the petitioner filed W.P.(CRL) 1554/2025 and during pendency of the same, he filed another writ petition, numbered W.P.(CRL) 1555/2025 after concealing the earlier writ petition. The W.P.(CRL) 1555/2025 was disposed of vide order dated 08.05.2025 directing the competent authority to decide parole application of the petitioner as expeditiously as possible but positively within time prescribed by law and the petitioner would file appropriate petition depending upon decision or even indecision of the competent



2025:DHC:4534



authority. Copy of that order dated 08.05.2025 is Annexure P-3.

3. But W.P.(CRL) 1554/2025 was concealed in W.P.(CRL) 1555/2025 and this petition as well. On being asked, learned counsel for the petitioner stated that he did not disclose about W.P.(CRL) 1554/2025 because that petition was dismissed as withdrawn.

4. Although, even a withdrawn petition ought to have been disclosed, but it appears that this statement of counsel for petitioner made at bar during submissions is false.

5. From the website of the Delhi High Court, a copy of Oral Judgment dated 09.05.2025 has been downloaded and the same reflects that W.P.(CRL) 1554/2025 was dismissed after discussion and not dismissed as withdrawn. As reflected from the Oral Judgment dated 09.05.2025, stand of the respondent State has been that antecedents of the petitioner do not support his case and that is the reason, he approached this court without waiting for the decision of the competent authority.

6. Even the counsel appearing in W.P.(CRL) 1554/2025 was same, Mr. Chetan Bhardwaj, Advocate, who has appeared today and the disposal of that writ petition was by way of an Oral Judgment, dictated in open court in his presence. That being so, it is not just a case of concealment but also making false submissions during arguments.

7. Rather, Oral Judgment dated 09.05.2025 also reflects that the two



2025:DHC:4534



parole applications were filed by the sister of the petitioner. Even the present petition has been filed by the same lady, through the same counsel.

8. Considering the above circumstances, I do not find it a fit case to invoke writ jurisdiction. The petition is dismissed with a warning to the counsel not to repeat such conduct.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA  
(JUDGE)**

**MAY 28, 2025/DR**